

*G. V. H. Danner*  
 THE  
 AMERICAN  
*Cincinnati Ohio*  
 PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL  
 REVIEW.

EDITORS:

HENRY B. SMITH AND J. M. SHERWOOD.

Associate Editors:

ALBERT BARNES,  
 THOMAS BRAINERD, } Philadelphia.

MOSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.  
 JONATHAN B. CONDIT, Auburn Theological Seminary, N. Y.  
 GEORGE E. DAY, Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

---

OCTOBER 1866.

---

NEW YORK:

WILLIAM SHERWOOD, No. 654 BROADWAY,

(At the Book Store of CHARLES SCRIBNER &amp; Co.)

PHILADELPHIA:

PRESBYTERIAN BOOKSTORE, 1334 CHESTNUT STREET.

BOSTON: A. WILLIAMS &amp; CO.

# NEW BOOKS,

Just Ready, and Published by

**CHARLES SCRIBNER & CO.,**  
654 Broadway, New York.

## A NEW VOLUME OF LANGE'S COMMENTARY.

**LANGE'S COMMENTARY ON ACTS;** Edited by Rev. Dr. Chas. F. Schaeffer,

"	"	<b>MATHEW,</b>	1 vol., royal octavo - - \$5.00.
"	"	<b>MARK AND LUKE,</b>	1 vol. (6th Edition) - - \$5.00.
			1 vol. (4th Edition) - - \$5.00.

*New Volumes.*

## DR P. SCHAFF'S CHURCH HISTORY,

History of the Christian Church, from the Accession of Constantine the Great, to the Pontificate of Gregory the First, or from the beginning of the Fourth to the close of the Sixth Century. By Rev. Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF. This completes the History of Ancient Christianity.

*Two New Volumes (7 and 8) of*

## FROUDE'S ENGLAND.

**HISTORY OF ENGLAND,** from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By JAMES A. FROUDE, M. A., of Exeter College, Oxford. In crown 8vo. vols. Price, \$3.00 per volume.

We Propose to Publish

## THE DEBATES IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

OF THE

### PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (OLD SCHOOL).

**FOR THE LAST THIRTY YEARS.** In 1 Vol., Octavo. 800 pp. Price, \$5.

The substance of these Debates has been annually reported, since 1836, in the "Princeton Review," and it is from these Reports it is proposed to draw the contents of this volume.

The last thirty years have been one of the most important periods in the history of the Presbyterian Church. A record of the Debates in the General Assembly will present a view of all the great measures adopted, and of the principles of doctrine and polity which have been discussed. Such a record will, it is believed, be of great value, especially to the younger class of our ministers.

The volume will be put to press as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers is obtained to justify the enterprise.

WE HAVE JUST IMPORTED A SMALL EDITION OF

## WORDSWORTH'S COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE.

**I. THE GREEK TESTAMENT,** With Introductions, Notes, and Indexes.

**BY CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D. D.**

ARCHDEACON AND CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

**COMPLETE IN TWO VOLS. IMPERIAL 8vo. CLOTH EXTRA. \$35.00.**

**II. THE OLD TESTAMENT,** With Notes and Introductions.

**IN IMPERIAL 8vo., UNIFORM WITH THE AUTHOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT.**

VOLUMES ALREADY PUBLISHED:

<b>THE PENTATEUCH Complete</b>	- - - - -	1 Volume.
<b>JOSHUA, JUDGES, RUTH</b>	- - - - -	1 Volume.
<b>TWO BOOKS OF SAMUEL</b>	- - - - -	1 Volume.

THREE VOLUMES, CLOTH EXTRA. \$30.00.

SUCCESSING PARTS ARE IN PREPARATION.

### THE GREEK TESTAMENT

forms two large volumes, and has already run through several editions. The Greek Text is an original one, formed from a collation of MSS., guided by a spiritless solicitude of broaching novelties, than of gaining assurance for what is old and universally received. A complete collation of the recently-discovered Sinaitic MS. is given, and the effects of sound scholarship are everywhere manifest, though no parade is made of its processes.

### THE OLD TESTAMENT,

now in rapid progress, was undertaken on the completion of the former work. Its scope and objects are thus described by Dr. Wordsworth: "The Introductions and Notes on the Old Testament are written on the same plan as those already published on the New. They are designed for Theological Students, and for English readers generally. They are expository, doctrinal, and practical; and the editor has availed himself of the helps afforded by the Ancient Fathers of the Church, the best English Divines, and the most approved Foreign Biblical Critics. The Text adopted is that of the AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION, with marginal readings and references, and divided into paragraphs. Whoever that translation is capable of improvement, the editor has endeavored to suggest the requisite emendations in the Notes. It has also been his purpose to supply solutions of such difficulties as have been raised, and to provide answers to such objections as have been alleged against the authority of the Hebrew Word; and to show the truth of the Apostolic declaration that 'All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God.' (2 Tim. iii. 16.)"

It has further been a main design of his Commentary on the Old Testament, to endeavor to restore the Biblical Criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures to that Standard of Exposition, which was set up by the Son of God himself, and by His Holy Apostles; and which was the received standard of the Ancient Christian Church, and to show that if the Old Testament is read without habitual reference to Christ, it is read "with a veil on the heart," and that this "veil is done away in Christ" (2 Cor. iii. 14, 15), and that the true meaning of the Old Testament is to be derived from a diligent study of the New.

As another of Dr. Wordsworth's Works are stereotyped, only a limited supply is procurable at the present reduced rate.







THE  
A M E R I C A N  
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL  
REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES. No. XVI.—OCTOBER, 1866.

---

ART. I.—THE DIFFERENT SPECIES OF SERMONS, AND THE  
CHOICE OF A TEXT.

By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D. D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary.

IN classifying sermons, it is well to follow the example of the scientific man, and employ as generic distinctions as possible. It is never desirable to distinguish a great many particulars, and elevate them into an undue prominence by converting them into generals. That classification, therefore, which would regard the “applicatory” sermon, the “observational” sermon, and such like, as distinct classes, only contributes to the confusion and embarrassment of the inquirer. The three most generic species of sermons, are the *topical*, the *textual*, and the *expository*.

The Topical Sermon is one in which there is but a single leading idea. This idea sometimes finds a formal expression in a proposition, and sometimes it pervades the discourse as a whole, without being distinctly pre-announced. Topical sermons are occupied with one definite subject or topic, which can be accurately and fully stated in a brief title. South preaches a discourse of this kind from Numbers, xxxii. 23 :

"Be sure your sin will find you out." The proposition of the sermon is this: "Concealment of sin is no security to the sinner." The leading idea of the discourse is, the *concealment* of sin; and the particular idea in the hearer to which this idea in the sermon is referred is, the idea of *happiness*.\* The concealment of sin is incompatible with the soul's peace and enjoyment; and the positions by which the idea or proposition of the sermon is led back to this fundamental idea in the moral condition of the hearer are these: 1. The sinner's very confidence of secrecy is the cause of his detection. 2. There is sometimes a providential concurrence of unexpected events which leads to his detection. 3. One sin is sometimes the means of discovering another. 4. The sinner may unwittingly discover himself through frenzy and distraction. 5. The sinner may be forced to discover himself by his own conscience. 6. The sinner may be suddenly smitten by some notable judgment that discloses his guilt, or, 7. His guilt will follow him into another world, if he should chance to escape in this.

The topical sermon is more properly an oration than either of the other species. It is occupied with a single definite theme that can be completely enunciated in a brief proposition. All of its parts are subservient to the theoretical establishment of but one idea or proposition in the mind of the hearer, and to the practical realization of it in his conduct. In the case of the textual sermon, as we shall see when we come to examine it, there is less certainty of unity in the subject, and consequently less in the structure of the discourse. And the expository sermon partakes still less of the characteristics of oratory and eloquence.

Inasmuch as the topical sermon approaches nearest to the unity, and symmetry, and conveyance to a single point, of the oration proper, it is the model species for the preacher. By this is meant that the sermon, ideally, should contain one leading thought, rather than several. It should be the embodiment of a single proposition, rather than a collection of sev-

---

\* THEREMIN: Rhetoric. pp. 72-75.

eral propositions. It should announce but one single doctrine in its isolation and independence, instead of exhibiting several doctrines in their interconnection and mutual dependence. The sermon should preserve an oratorical character. It should never allow the philosophical or the poetical element to predominate over the rhetorical. The sermon should be eloquence and not poetry or philosophy. It should be a discourse that exhibits singleness of aim, and a converging progress towards an outward practical end.

It is for this reason, therefore, that we lay down the position, that the topical sermon is the model species for the sermonizer. If he constructs a textual sermon, he should endeavor to render it as topical as is possible.\* He should aim to pervade it with but one leading idea, to embody in it but one doctrine, and to make it teach but one lesson. In constructing an expository sermon, also, the preacher should make the same endeavor; and although he must in this instance be less successful, he may facilitate his aim, by selecting for exposition only such a passage of Scripture as has but one general drift, and conveys but one general sentiment.

The importance of this maxim may be best seen, by considering the fact, that sermons are more defective in respect to unity of structure, and a constant progress towards a single end, than in any other respect. But these are strictly oratorical qualities, and can be secured only by attending to the nature and laws of eloquence,—to the rhetorical as distinguished from the philosophical presentation of truth. Too many sermons contain matter enough for two or three orations, and consequently are not themselves orations. This is true of the elder English sermonizers, in whom the matter is generally superior to the form. Take the following plan of a sermon of South (in oratorical respects, the best of the earlier English

---

\* This is not to be attained by making the plan a mixture of topical and textual,—by stating a proposition, and following with a purely textual division. The plan should be textual, but the style and movement of the discourse should be distinguished, so far as possible, by unity, simplicity, and progressiveness,—that is, by oratorical or topical qualities.

preachers) on Jer. vi. 15: "Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? Nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush: therefore they shall fall among them that fall: at the time that I visit them they shall be cast down, saith the Lord." It is a topical discourse. The theme or proposition is: "Shamelessness in sin is the certain forerunner of destruction." The sermon contains sixteen pages, of which only four and a half are filled with matter that, upon strictly rhetorical principles, goes to establish the proposition. The first three quarters of the sermon are occupied with an analysis of the *nature* of "shamelessness in sin." The discourse is shaped too disproportionately by the category of truth,—a category that is subordinate, and should not be allowed so much influence in the structure and moulding of an oration.\* The consequence is, that this sermon possesses far less of that oratorical fire and force so generally characteristic of South. It is not throughout pervaded by its own fundamental proposition. It does not gather momentum as it proceeds. There is no greater energy of style and diction at the end than at the beginning. It is clear; it is instructive; it has many and great excellencies; but it lacks the excellence of being a true oration,—a rounded and symmetrical discourse, pervaded by one idea, breathing but one spirit, rushing forward with a uniformly accelerating motion, and ending with an overpowering impression and influence upon the will. This discourse would be more truly topical, and thus more truly oratorical, if the proportions had been just the reverse of what they now are; if but one fourth of it had been moulded by the metaphysical category of truth, and the remaining three-fourths by the practical idea of happiness; if the discussion of the nature of shamelessness in sin had filled four pages, and the *reasons why* it brings down destruction, or unhappiness, upon the sinner, had filled the remaining twelve.

The Textual Sermon is one in which the passage of Scrip-

---

\* THEREMIN: Rhetoric, Book I. Chap. X.



ture is broken up, and either its leading words or its leading clauses become the heads of the discourse. For example, Rom. xiv. 12: "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God," might be the foundation of a discourse upon human accountability. The divisions are formed by emphasizing the leading words, and thereby converting them into the divisions of the sermons as follows: 1. An *account* is to be rendered. 2. This account is to be rendered to *God*. 3. *Every one* is to render this account,—mankind generally. 4. Every one of *us* is to render this account,—men as individuals. 5. Every one of us is to render an account of *himself*.

It is not necessary that the words of the text should be employed, as in the example given above. The substance of the separate clauses may be made the divisions, and the sermon still be textual. Barrows has a sermon founded on Eph. v. 20: "Giving thanks always for all things unto God." The plan is as follows: 1. The duty itself,—giving thanks. 2. The object to whom thanks are to be directed,—to God. 3. The time of performing the duty,—always. 4. The matter and extent of the duty,—for all things.

What are sometimes termed "observational" sermons, are also textual. The following taken from a plan of a sermon by Beddome upon Acts ix. 4: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me," will illustrate this. The observations upon this text are suggested either by the text as a whole, or by some of its parts. 1. It is the general character of unconverted men to be of a persecuting spirit. This character is suggested by the text as a whole. 2. Christ has his eye upon persecutors. This observation is also suggested by the text as a whole. 3. The injury done to Christ's people, Christ considers as done to himself. This observation is suggested by a part of the text,—by an emphasized word in it, "why persecutest thou *me*." 4. The calls of Christ are particular. This observation is suggested by a part of the text,—"*Saul, Saul*."

There are two things requisite to the production of a good textual sermon, viz: a significant text, and a talent to discover its significance. The text must contain distinct and

emphatic conceptions to serve as the parts of the division. In the text given above, Rom. xiv. 12, "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God," there are these distinct and emphatic ideas: (a) An account. (b) A Judge. (c) Humanity generally. (d) The individual in particular. (e) Personal confession. These fertile conceptions are full of matter, and the skill of the sermonizer is seen in the thoroughness and brevity with which he exhausts them and their contents. Upon the number, variety, and richness of such distinct and emphatic ideas in a text depends its fitness for textual discourse.

Again, the text, in case it does not contain a number of such conceptions, needs contain a number of distinct positions, or affirmations, to serve as parts of the division. There may be no single conceptions in a text suitable to constitute the plan of a sermon, while there are several statements in it, direct or implied. Take, for example, Ps. xc. 10: "The days of our years are threescore years and ten: and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow: for it is soon cut off, and we fly away." The single conceptions in this text are not weighty enough to constitute heads in a discourse, but the affirmations, the positions, the statements implied in it, are. This text, treated in this way, would furnish the following divisions of a textual sermon; 1. Human life, however lengthened out, must come to an end. 2. Human life, at longest, is very short. 3. That which is added to the ordinary duration of human life is, after all, but little to be desired.

The second requisite in order to the production of a good textual sermon is a talent to detect these emphatic conceptions, or these direct or indirect positions in a passage of Scripture. A preacher destitute of this talent will pass by many texts that really are full of the materials of textual sermonizing. He has no eye to discover the rich veins that lie concealed just under the dull and uninteresting surface. If a text is so plain that he needs only to call out the leading words,—if the formation of the plan is merely a *verbalizing*

process,—he can, perhaps, succeed in constructing a textual discourse that will probably be common-place, because its structure is so very evident and easy. But the number of such texts is small, and the range of such a sermonizer must be narrow. A tact is needed in the preacher to discover the hidden skeleton. This tact will be acquired gradually, and surely, by every one who carefully cultivates himself in all homiletic respects. Like all nice discernment, it comes imperceptibly in the course of training and discipline, and therefore no single and particular rule for its acquisition can be laid down. It must be acquired, however, or the fundamental talent for textual sermonizing will be wanting. Moreover, this tact should be judicious. It is possible to find more meaning in a text than it really contains. The Rabbinic notion, that mountains of sense are contained in every letter of the inspired volume, may be adopted to such an extent, at least, as to lead the preacher into a fanciful method that is destructive of all impressive and effective discourse. This talent for detecting the significance of Scripture must be confined to the gist of it,—to the evident and complete substance of it.

The Expository Sermon, as its name indicates, is an explanatory discourse. The purpose of it is, to unfold the meaning of a connected paragraph or section of Scripture, in a more detailed manner than is consistent with the structure, of either the topical or the textual sermon. Some writers upon Homiletics would deny it a place among sermons, and contend that it cannot legitimately contain enough of the oratorical structure and character to justify its being employed for purposes of persuasion. They affirm that the expository discourse is purely and entirely dialectic, and can no more be classified with the connected and symmetrical productions of oratory and eloquence, than the commentary or the paraphrase can be.

But while it is undoubtedly true that the expository sermon is the farthest removed from the oration, both in its structure and in its movement, it is not necessary that it should be as

totally unoratorical as a piece of commentary, or a paraphrase. An expository discourse should have a logical structure, and be pervaded by a leading sentiment, as really as a topical sermon. And it ought to be certainly free from the dilution of a mere paraphrase. It should have a beginning, middle, and end, and thus be more than a piece of commentary. In short, we lay down the same rule in relation to the expository sermon that we did in relation to the textual: viz, that it be assimilated to the topical model as closely as the nature of the species permits. But in order to this assimilation, it is necessary to select for exposition, a passage, or paragraph of Scripture that is somewhat complete in itself. The distinction between expository preaching and commentary, originates in the selection, in the former instance, of a rounded and self-included portion of inspiration, as the foundation of discourse, while in the latter instance, the mind is allowed to run on indefinitely, to the conclusion of the book or the epistle. The excellence of an expository sermon, consequently, depends primarily upon the choice of such a portion of Scripture as will not lead the preacher on and on, without allowing him to arrive at a proper termination. Unless a passage is taken that finally comes round in a full circle, containing one leading sentiment, and teaching one grand lesson,—like a parable of our Lord,—the expository sermon must either be commentary or paraphrase. And if it be either of these, it cannot be classed among sermons, because the utmost it can accomplish is information. Persuasion, the proper function and distinguishing characteristic of eloquence, forms no part of its effects upon an audience.

Even when a suitable passage has been selected the sermonizer will need to employ his strongest logical talents, and his best rhetorical ability, to impart sufficiently of the oratorical form and spirit to the expository sermon. He will need to watch his mind, and his plan, with great care, lest the discourse overflow its banks, and spread out in all directions, losing the current, and the deep strong volume of eloquence. This species of sermonizing is very liable to have a dilution of

divine truth, instead of an exposition. Perhaps, among modern preachers, Chalmers exhibits the best example of the expository sermon. The oratorical structure and spirit of his mind enabled him to create a current in almost every species of discourse which he undertook, and through his Lectures on Romans we find a strong unifying stream of eloquence constantly setting in, with an increasing and surging force, from the beginning to the end. The expository preaching of this distinguished sacred orator is well worth studying in the respect of which we are speaking.

Having thus briefly sketched characteristics of the three species of sermons, the question naturally arises: To what extent is each to be employed by the preacher?

The first general answer to this question is, that *all* the species should be employed by every sermonizer without exception. No matter what the turn or temper of his mind may be, he should build upon each and every one of these patterns. If he is highly oratorical in his heart and spirit, let him by no means neglect the expository sermon. If his mental temperament is phlegmatic, and his mental processes naturally cool and unimpassioned, let him by no means neglect the topical sermon.

It is too generally the case, that the preacher follows his tendency, and preaches uniformly one kind of sermons. A more severe dealing with his own powers, and a wiser regard for the wants of his audience, would lead to more variety in sermonizing. At times, the mind of the congregation needs the more stirring and impressive influence of a topical discourse, to urge it up to action. At others, it needs the instruction and indoctrination of the less rhetorical, and more didactic expositions of Scripture.

And this leads to the further remark, as a definite reply to the question above raised, that the preacher should employ all three of the species, in the order in which they have been discussed.

Speaking generally, it is safe to say that the plurality of

sermons should be topical,—pervaded by a single idea, or containing a single proposition, and converging by a constant progress to a single point. For this is the model species as we have seen. The textual and the expository sermon must be as closely assimilated to this species as is possible, by being founded upon a single portion of Scripture that is complete in itself, and by teaching one general lesson.

Moreover, textual and expository sermons will not be likely to possess this oratorical structure, and to breathe this eloquent spirit, unless the preacher is in the habit of constructing proper orations,—unless he understands the essential distinctions between eloquence and philosophy,—unless he feels the difference, and makes his audience feel the difference, between the sacred essay and the sacred oration.

Next in order, follows the textual sermon; and this species is next in value for the purposes of persuasion. Easy and natural in its structure,—its parts being either the repetition of Scripture phraseology, or else suggestions from it,—the textual sermon should be frequently employed by the preacher.

And, lastly, the expository sermon should be occasionally employed. There is somewhat less call for this variety, than there was before the establishment of Sabbath-schools and Bible-classes. Were it not that these have taken the exposition of Scripture into their own charge, one very considerable part of the modern preacher's duty—as it was of the Christian Fathers and the Reformers—would be to expound the Bible. Under the present arrangement of the Christian Church, however, the ministry is relieved from this duty to a considerable extent. But it is not wholly relieved from it. It is the duty of the preacher occasionally to lay out his best strength in the production of an elaborate expository sermon—which shall not only do the ordinary work of a sermon, which shall not only instruct, awaken and move, but which shall also serve as a sort of guide and model for the teacher of the Sabbath-school and the Bible-class. Such sermonizing becomes an aid to the instructor in getting at the substance of the Scripture, and in bringing it out before the



minds of the young. Probably the preacher can take no course so well adapted to raise the standard of Sabbath-school and Bible-class instruction in his congregation, as by occasionally delivering a well-constructed and carefully elaborated expository discourse.

By employing, in this manner, all three of the species, in their relation and proper proportions, the preacher will accomplish more for his people, and for his own mind, than by confining himself to one species only. As the years of his minority roll on, he will bring the whole Bible into contact with the hearts and consciences of his audience. Divine revelation will, in this way, become all that it is capable of becoming for the mind of man, because all its elements will be wrought into the mass of society. The preacher himself will perform all his functions, and not a portion only. He will instruct and awaken, he will indoctrinate and enkindle, he will inform and move, he will rebuke, reprove and exhort. In short, he will in this way minister to the greatest variety of wants, and build up the greatest variety and breadth of Christian character in the church.

After this analysis of the different varieties of sermons, we pass, next, to the consideration of their foundation. A sermon is built upon a passage of Scripture, which is denominated a *text*. This term is derived from the Latin *tex tum*, which signifies woven. The text, therefore, etymologically denotes, either a portion of inspiration that is woven into the whole web of holy writ, and which, therefore, must be interpreted in its connection and relations, or else a portion of inspiration that is woven into the whole fabric of the sermon. We need not confine ourselves to either meaning exclusively, but may combine both significations. A text, then, is a passage of inspiration which is woven primarily into the web of Holy Writ, and secondarily into the web of a discourse. By uniting both of the etymological meanings of the word, we are led to observe the two great facts, that the subject of a sermon is an organic part of Scripture, and therefore should not

be torn away alive and bleeding from the body of which it is a vital part; and, secondly, that the subject or text of a sermon should pervade the whole structure which it serves to originate and organize. If this definition of the text be kept in mind, and practically acted upon, it will prevent the sermonizer from treating it out of its connection with the context and the general tenor of revelation, and will lead him to regard it as the formative principle and power of his sermon, and to make it such. The text, then, will not be tortured to teach a doctrine contrary to the general teachings of inspiration, and it will be something more than a motto for a series of observations drawn from a merely human source, the preacher's own mind.

The custom of founding religious discourse upon a text has pervaded ever since there has been a body of inspiration from which to take a text. In the patriarchal age religious teachers spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, without a passage from the canon of inspiration, because the canon was not yet formed. Noah was a "*preacher of righteousness*," and probably reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, much as Paul did before Felix, without any formal proposition derived from a body of Holy Writ. As early as the time of Ezra, however, we find the Sacred Canon, which during the captivity had fallen into neglect, made the basis of religious instruction. Ezra, accompanied by Levites, in a public congregation "read in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading."\* Our Saviour, as his custom was (conforming undoubtedly to the general Jewish custom), went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and "stood up for to read" the Old Testament. He selected the first and part of the second verse of the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah for his text, and preached a sermon upon it, which fastened the eyes of every man in the synagogue upon him in the very beginning, and which, notwithstanding its gracious words, finally developed their

---

\* Nehemiah viii. 6-8.

latent malignity, filled them with wrath, so that they led him to the brow of the precipice on which their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong.\* The apostles also frequently discoursed from passages of Scripture. Peter, soon after the return of the disciples from the Mount of Ascension, preached a discourse from Psalm lxix. 25, the object of which was to induce the Church to choose an apostle in the place of Judas.† And again, on the day of Pentecost, this same apostle preached a discourse founded upon Joel ii. 28-32, which was instrumental in the conversion of three thousand souls.‡ Sometimes, again, the discourse, instead of being more properly homiletic, was an abstract of sacred history. The discourse of Stephen, when arraigned before the high priest, was of this kind.§ The dense and mighty discourse of Paul on Mars Hill, if examined, will be found to be made up, in no small degree, of statements and phrases that imply a thorough acquaintance with the Old Testament. They are all fused and amalgamated, it is true, with the thoughts that came fresh and new from Paul's own inspiration, and yet they are part and particle of the earlier inspiration under the Jewish economy.

The homilies of the early Christian Church, in the post-apostolic age, were imitations of these discourses in the Jewish Synagogue, and of these sermons of the apostles. They became more elaborate and rhetorical, in proportion, as audiences became more cultivated; and, on the other hand, they became less exultant, both in matter and in form, in proportion as the church became ignorant and superstitious. But during all the changes which the sermon underwent, it continued to be founded upon a passage of Scripture, and to contain more or less of Scripture matter and phraseology. Melancthon does indeed mention, as one of the inconsistencies and prodigious errors of Popery, that the Ethics of Aristotle were read in church, and that texts were taken from his writings. Still, as

---

\* Luke iv. 16-28.

† Acts ii. 14-36.

‡ Acts i. 15, sq.

§ Acts vii. 2-53.

a general thing, the ministry, whether scriptural or unscriptural in its character, has in all ages since there has been a collected Sacred Canon, gone to it for the foundation of its public discourse. That, at this time, there is less likelihood than ever before of this custom becoming antiquated, is one of the strongest grounds for believing that Christianity is to prevail throughout the earth. We have now the strongest reason for believing that to the end of time, wherever there shall be the sermon, there will be the Bible; and that wherever there shall be homiletic discourse, there will be a scriptural basis for it.

The following reasons may be assigned for selecting a passage of Scripture as the foundation of the sermon:

1. The selection puts honor upon Revelation. It is a tacit and very impressive acknowledgment that the Scriptures are the great source of religious knowledge. Every sermon that is preached, throughout Christendom, in its very beginning, and also through its whole structure, points significantly to the Divine Revelation, and in this way its paramount authority over all other literature is affirmed. No sermonizer could now take his text from a human production, even though it should contain the very substance, and breathe the very spirit of the Bible, without shocking the taste, and the religious sensibilities of his audience. This fact shows that the practice of which we are speaking, fosters reverence for the Word of God, and that it is consequently a good one.
2. The practice of selecting a text results in the extended exposition of the Scriptures to the general mind. Sermonizing, while it is truly oratorical, in this way becomes truly expository. The sermon is a regularly constructed discourse, and yet, when it is founded upon a text, and is pervaded by it, it contains more or less of commentary. In this way the general mind is made acquainted with the contents of Revelation.
3. The sermon, when based upon a text, is more likely to possess unity, and a methodical structure. If the preacher should give no one general direction to his mind by a passage of inspiration, the sermon would degenerate into a series of remarks which would

have little use, or apparent connection with each other. Like the observations of a person when called upon, without any premeditation, to make remarks in a public meeting, the sermon, though religious in its matter, would be more or less rambling in its manner. Without a text, the sermonizer would be likely to speak what came uppermost, provided only it had some reference to religion. And the ill effects of this course would not stop here. The sermon would become more and more rambling, and less and less religious in its character, until, owing to this neglect of the Scriptures, it would eventually become dissevered from them, and the sacred oration would thus become secular. 4. The selection of a text aids the memory of the hearer. It furnishes him with a brief statement which contains the whole substance of the sermon, and is a clue to lead him through its several parts. We all know that the hearer betakes himself to the text, first of all, when called upon to give an account of a discourse. If he remembers the text, he is generally able to mention the proposition, and more or less of the trains of thought. 5. The text gives authority to the preacher's words. The sermon, when it is really founded upon a passage of inspiration, and is truly pervaded by it, possesses a sort of semi-inspiration itself. It is more than a merely human and secular product. The Holy Spirit acknowledges it as such, by employing it for purposes of conviction and conversion. A merely and wholly human production, properly secular eloquence, is not one of those things which the Holy Ghost "takes and shows unto the soul." A truly Scriptural discourse, provided we do not strain the phraseology too far, has much of the authority of Scripture itself.

The following are some of the rules that should guide in the choice of a text : 1. A passage of Scripture should be selected towards which the mind at the time spontaneously moves. Choose a text that attracts and strikes the mind. The best sermons are written upon such passages, because the preacher enters into them with vigor and heartiness. Yet such texts are not always to be found. They do not present themselves

at the very moment they are wanted. Hence, the sermonizer should aid nature by art, should cultivate spontaneity by prudence and forethought. He should keep a book of texts, in which he habitually and carefully writes down *every* text that strikes him, *together with* all of the skeleton that presents itself to him at the time. Let him by no means omit this last particular. In this way the spontaneous movements of his mind will be on record. The fresh and genial texts that occur, together with the original and genial plans which they suggest, will all be within reach. A sermonizer who thus aids nature by art will never be at a loss for subjects. He will be embarrassed more by his riches than his poverty.

2. A text should be complete in itself. By this, it is not meant that it should be short. No rule can be given for the length of a text. The most that is required is, that the passage of Scripture selected as the foundation of the sacred oration, should, like the oration itself, be single, full, and unsuperfluous in its character. It should be single,—containing only one general theme. It should be full,—*i. e.* not a meagre and partial statement of this theme. It should be unsuperfluous,—*i. e.* not redundant in matter that would lead the sermonizer into trains of discussion and reflection, foreign to the one definite end of an oration.

Texts must vary in length from the necessity of the case. As a general rule, however, they should be as brief as is compatible with completeness. Short texts are more easily remembered. They are more likely to result in concise and effective sermons,—in sermons that are free from prolixity, and that converge constantly to a single ultimate end. Sermonizers, like Latimer and South, who are distinguished for a rapid, driving method, affect short pithy texts like the following: "Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord." "He that walketh surely, walketh uprightly." "The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." "So that they are without excuse." "Be sure your sin will find you out." Again, preachers, like Alison and Blair, who are distinguished not very much for vigor and effectiveness, but for a clean, neat, and elegant



method, select brief texts like these: "Thou art the same: and thy years shall not fail." "In your patience possess ye your souls." "Can ye not discern the signs of the times?" "Thou hast made summer and winter." "What I would, that I do not." "Unstable as water thou shall not excel." It will be found to be true generally, that in proportion as a preacher's mind is awake and energetic, and the public mind is also awake and active, texts become brief, and sermons become direct and convergent. The texts of the sermons preached by the German and English reformers are short and frequent.

Besides being easily remembered, a short text allows of emphatic repetition. Some sermons become very effective by the reiteration of the inspired affirmation at the conclusion of each head. In this case, the text becomes a clincher. It fastens, like a nail in a sure place, all that has been said by the preacher. The affirmations of the preacher are *nailed*, to use a phrase of Burns, with Scripture.\*

3. A text should be chosen, from which the proposition of the sermon is derived plainly and naturally. Sometimes a preacher desires to present a certain subject, which he has revolved in his mind, and upon which his trains of thought are full and consecutive, and merely prefaces his sermon with a passage of Scripture which has only a remote connection with his theme. In this case, the relation of the sermon to the text is that of adjustment, rather than that of development. Having made selection of a passage from which his proposition and trains of thought do not naturally flow, he is compelled to torture the text into an apparent unity with the discourse. Rather than take this course, it would be better to make the text a mere motto, or title, and not pretend to an unfolding of a scriptural passage. But there is no need of this. The Bible is rich in texts for all legitimate sermons, for all propositions and trains of thought that properly arise with-

---

\* And even ministers, they ha'e been kenne'd  
In holy rapture,  
A rousing which at times to vend,  
And nail 't wi' Scripture.

in the province of sacred as distinctive from secular eloquence. Let the preacher take pains, and find the very passage he needs, and not content himself with one that has only an apparent connection with his subject.

But when the passage selected is a true text,—*i. e.* a portion of Scripture out of which the proposition, trains of thought, and whole substance of the discourse are *woven*,—let the preacher see to it, that he derives from it nothing that is not in it. His business is not to involve into the text something that is extrinsic, but to evolve out of it, something that is intrinsic. Hence, a text should be of such a character as to *evidently* furnish one plain and significant proposition, and to allow of a straight-forward, easy, and actual development of it.

4. Oddity and eccentricity should be avoided in selecting a text. There is more need of this rule now, than formerly. The public mind is more ludicrous in its associations, and more fastidious in its taste, now, than two centuries ago. In the older sermonizers, applications of Scripture are very frequent, which involuntarily provoke a smile in a modern reader, but which in their day were listened to with the utmost gravity by sober-minded men and women. The doctrine of a double sense, together with a strong allegorizing tendency, in both preacher and hearer, contributed to this use of Scripture which seems to us fanciful and oftentimes ludicrous.

Illustrations of this trait are without number. Dr. Eachard, whose volume gives a very lively picture of the condition of the English clergy at the close of the seventeenth, and the beginning of the eighteenth century, furnishes some curious examples of this eccentric spirit, both in the choice of texts, and in drawing out doctrine from it. He tells us of a preacher who selected Acts xvi. 30: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved," and preached upon the divine right of Episcopacy. "For Paul and Silas are called 'Sirs,' and 'Sirs' being in the Greek *κύριοι*, and this, in strict translation, meaning 'Lord,' it is perfectly plain, that at that time Episcopacy was not only the acknowledged government, but that bishops were peers of the realm, and so ought to sit in the House of Lords."

Another preacher, in the time of Charles II, he says, selected for his text the words: "Seek first the kingdom of God," and drew from them the proposition that kingly government is most in accordance with the will of God. "For it is not said, seek the *Parliament* of God, the *Army* of God, or the *Committee of Safety* of God; but it is, seek the *Kingdom* of God." Another preacher took Matthew i. 2: "Abraham begot Isaac," and argued against pluralists and non-residency in the ministry: "For had Abraham not resided with Sarah his wife, he could not have begot Isaac." Another sermonizer selected Isaiah xli. 14, 15: "Fear not thou worm Jacob, . . . thou shalt thresh mountains," and drew the inference that the worm Jacob was a threshing worm. In the same vein, another preacher takes for his text Isaiah lviii. 5: "Is it such a fast as I have chosen? A day for a man to afflict his soul? Is it to bow down his head like a bulrush?" and deduces the proposition that "repentance for an hour, or a day, is not worth a bulrush." Still another preacher selected his text from Psalms xc. 19: "In the multitude of my thoughts within me, thy comforts delight my soul," and preached upon election and reprobation, deducing the proposition, "that amongst the multitude of thoughts, there was a great thought of election and reprobation."\* Similar examples of eccentricity in the choice and treatment of a text, have been handed down from other sources. An aged New England minister, during the colonial period, once preached before a very unpopular deputy governor from Job xx. 6, 7: "Though his *Excellency* mount up to the heavens, and his head reach unto the clouds, yet he shall perish forever like his own dung." Another preached to the newly married couples of his congregation, upon a part of Psalm lxxii. 7: "And abundance of peace so long as the *moon* endureth." Dean Swift is reported to have preached the annual sermon to the Associated Tailors of Dublin, upon the text: "A *remnant* shall be saved." Among his printed sermons, there is one upon Acts xx. 9: "And there sat in the window a cer-

---

\* EACHARD: Works, 66 et al.

tain young man named Eutychus, having fallen into a deep sleep: and while Paul was long preaching, he sunk down with sleep: and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead," which thus begins: "I have chosen these words with design, if possible, to disturb some part in this audience of half an hour's sleep, for the convenience and exercise whereof this place, at this season of the day, is very much celebrated."\*

Such instances as these, however, are very different from that quaint humor of preachers like Hugh Latimer, and Matthew Henry, which is so mingled with devout and holy sentiment, as to lose all triviality, and to make only a serious impression. The following from the commentary of Henry, while it raises a smile, only deepens the sense of the truth conveyed. Commenting upon the requirement of the Mosaic law that the green ears of corn, offered as a meat offering, must be dried by the fire, so that the corn might be beaten out, Henry remarks, that "if those who are young do God's work as well as they can, they shall be accepted, though they cannot do it as well as those that are aged and experienced. God makes the best of green ears of corn, and so must we."†

A disputed text should not be selected as the basis of a discourse. This rule applies more particularly to doctrinal preaching, yet it has its value for sermonizing generally. The preacher should choose the very plainest, most significant and pointed passages of Scripture as the support of his doctrinal discourses. He is then relieved from the necessity of first proving that the doctrine in question is taught in the passage, and can devote his whole time and strength to its exposition and establishment. The less there is of polemics in sacred oratory, the better. The more there is of direct inculcation, without any regard to opposing theories and statements, the more efficient, energetic, and oratorical will be the sermon. The controversial tone is unfavorable to the bold, positive, unembarrassed tone of sacred eloquence. Disputed texts

---

\* SWIFT: Works XIV. Sermon 10.

† HENRY: Com. on Leviticus iii. 14.

should, therefore, be left to the philologist and the theologian. When these have settled their true meaning, so far as it can be settled, such texts may be employed to corroborate, and to illustrate, but not to build upon from the foundation.

By this it is not meant that the preacher has no concern with such passages of inspiration. The preacher is, or should be, a philologist and a theologian, and in his study should examine such passages, and form a judgment in respect to them. But let him not do this work in the pulpit. The pulpit is the place for the delivery of eloquence, and not of philology, or philosophy, or technical theology. The rhetorical presentation of thought is the mode which the preacher is to employ, and nothing more interferes with this than the minute examinations of criticism, and the slow and cautious processes of pure science.

This maxim is also valuable, not only in reference to strictly doctrinal preaching, but to all preaching. The text is, or should be, the key-note to the whole sermon. The more bold, the more undoubted and undisputed its tone, the better. A text of this character is like a premonitory blast of a trumpet. It challenges attention, and gets it. It startles and impresses by its direct and authoritative announcement of a great and solemn proposition. Nothing remains then, but for the preacher to go out upon it with his whole weight; to unfold and apply its evident undoubted meaning, with all the moral confidence, and all the serious earnestness of which he is capable.

The inference to be drawn from these reasons for the selection of a passage of Scripture as the foundation of a sermon, and these rules for making the selection is, that the greatest possible labor and care should be expended upon the choice of a text. As in secular oratory, the selection for a subject is either vital or fatal to the whole performance; so in sacred oratory the success of the preacher depends fundamentally upon the fitness of his choice of a text. The text is his subject. It is the germ of his whole discourse. Provided, therefore, he has found an apt and excellent text, he has found his sermon substantially.

All labor, therefore, that is expended upon a text is wisely and economically expended. Every jot and tittle of painstaking, in fixing upon paper a congenial passage of Scripture, and in setting up all of the skeleton that presents itself at the time; every jot and tittle of painstaking in examining the passage in the original Hebrew or Greek, in studying, in these same languages, the context, and all the parallel passages; every particle of care in first obtaining an excellent text, and then getting at and getting out its real meaning and scope, goes to render the actual construction and composition of the sermon more easy and successful. Labor at this point saves labor at all after points.

The preacher should make careful and extensive preparation in respect to pulpit themes. His common-place book of texts should be a large volume in the outset, and, if he is faithful to himself and his calling, he will find the volumes increasing. Instead of buying the volumes of skeletons that are so frequently offered at the present day, the preacher should make them for himself. It was formerly the custom, in an age that was more theological than the present, for every preacher to draw up a "body of divinity" for himself,—the summing up and result of his studies and reflections. Every preacher knew what his theological system was, and could state it, and defend it. And, although at first sight, we might suppose that this custom would lead to great diversities of opinion among the clergy, it is yet a fact, that there never was more substantial and candid unity of belief, than among the Calvinistic clergy of England and the Continent, during those highly theological centuries, the sixteenth and seventeenth. There was no invention of new theories, but the old and established theory, the one orthodox faith of the Christian church, was made to pass through each individual mind, and so come forth with all the freshness and freedom of a new creation. "He who has been born," says Richter, "has been a first man, has had the old and common world lying about him as new and as fresh, as it lay before the eyes of Adam himself." So, too, he who, in the providence and by the grace of God, has



become a theologian and a preacher, has no other world of thought and of feeling to move in, than that old world of Divine Revelation, in which the glorious company of the apostles, and the goodly fellowship of the prophets and preachers thought and felt; but if he will open his eyes, and realize where he stands, and by what he is surrounded, he will see it as his predecessors saw it, in all the freshness of its real nature, and in all the magnificence of its actual infinitudes. Whether or not, the preacher imitates this example of an earlier day in regard to theologizing, he ought to in regard to sermonizing. Let him not rely at all upon the texts and skeletons of other preachers, but let him cultivate this field by himself, and for himself, as if it had never been tilled before. Let him pursue this business of selecting, examining, decomposing, and recombining textual materials, with all the isolation and independence of the first preachers, and of all the great original orators of the Christian church.

---

#### ART. II.—JESUS CHRIST AND CRIMINAL LAW.

By PROF. E. BALLANTINE, of Lane Seminary.

DID our Lord, when brought into contact with the officers of the law and the courts of justice, ignore the principles and rules of criminal law, as they are generally received, or did he recognize and observe them?

The answer to this interesting question must be drawn from the combined histories of the evangelists. That we may not be drawn aside to incidental questions, we shall follow the arrangement of events as given in Robinson's Harmony. We notice only those passages which bear on the point before us, and discuss them only so far as they bear on that point; passing by, with a kind of violence to our feelings, the abundant and rich material which they furnish of a general character, in order that in the end their total significance may be the

better appreciated, and thus our Lord himself be better understood, and more highly honored.

Jesus was arrested in the garden of Gethsemane; it was about midnight. "Then Judas, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns, and torches, and weapons. Jesus, therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. As soon then as he had said unto them, I am he, they went backward and fell to the ground. Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he. If, therefore, ye seek me, let these go their way." (John xviii. 3-8.)

Observe, now, that Jesus, thus brought suddenly into contact with the law and its officers, did not flee, or hide, or try to confuse them in regard to his identity. "He went forth," stepped forward toward them, and frankly declared himself. He used, moreover, a precision and formality of language, quite unlike his ordinary manner, but entirely in keeping with the style and manner of legal processes. That this precision and formality were not accidental, but designed and significant, is shown first, by the fact that Judas's kiss made them unnecessary to his identification, and second, by the fact of the full and formal repetition of the whole after the interruption made by the temporary confusion of his captors. In his words to them, when they came up the second time, "I have told you," (*i. e.* already) that I am he," Jesus chides their delay in taking him, as inconsistent with the promptness appropriate to their business, and hints at a consciousness of the injustice of that business as its cause. He then puts in a legal plea for the safety of his friends. "The law seeks only the criminal: it interferes with none other. If therefore ye seek me, let these go." By this last word also he surrenders himself to their hands.

In this new situation Jesus thus showed that he understood the course and demeanor which are proper, both for arresting

and arrested parties, observed them himself, and pointed them out to his captors. He was dignified, frank and courteous in manner, formal and precise as to the process of arrest, ready and right in his legal positions, in behalf both of himself and of his disciples.

"Then the band and the captain, and the officers of the Jews took Jesus and bound him." (John xviii. 12.) Jesus submitted quietly, but Peter could not see his master treated like a felon. He "drew his sword and struck a servant of the high priest, and smote off his ear. Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place." (Matth. xxvi. 51, 52.) "And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far. And he touched his ear and healed him." (Luke xxii. 51.)

Jesus thus rejected the assistance of the sword against the administrators of the law. He taught that violent resistance to arresting officers is not the right course. These are not the place, nor the time, nor the parties, nor the means, for the assertion and the maintenance of the citizen's liberty. He acknowledged all this promptly to the officers, guaranteed that the resistance should go no farther, deprecated their vengeance on the offender, and conciliated their forbearance by the miraculous cure of the wound. Law officers have their rights, which are to be regarded by the citizen. An act of an accessory, if allowed, is the act of the principal. A wrong step taken by one of the parties, should be promptly retraced, acknowledged, and made good. An arrested man may suffer, but must not do wrong. All this was expressed by the words and actions of Jesus in these first moments of his arrest, and while strong men were tying his arms and held him fast. In circumstances so calculated to excite and confuse, he was clear, ready, and impartial, in regard to what was legally right and wrong in the circumstance.

This is made more clear by that which immediately followed. The unjust arrest, though submitted to, was not to pass without a protest from the prisoner.

"Jesus said unto them, Are ye come out as against a thief, with swords and with staves to take me? I was daily with

you in the temple teaching and ye took me not." (Mark xiv. 48, 49.)

He objects to the place, the time, and the mode of his arrest. It did injustice to himself, his character, and his course of life. The sly thief, or skulking burglar, who hides from the light of day, and from the sight of men, may perhaps be sought and taken thus. But a man like himself, who appeared daily in the places of public resort teaching the people, without arms or armed attendants, and always deporting himself peaceably and quietly, such a man has a right to a different kind of treatment from the officers of the law. They, when commissioned to arrest such a one, should meet him in the places of his public walks, and there serve process upon him. There was no need in his case of a posse, much less of an armed one. A citizen who respects the government, and obeys the laws, will not resist the exercise of legal authority. Public sentiment will sustain that authority when rightly exercised; and the same public sentiment is, on the other hand, the safeguard of the innocent citizen, of which he ought not to be deprived. A clandestine seizure, except in the case mentioned, implies, therefore, its own injustice. It is tyrannical, outrageous, and very likely irregular and unauthorized. "And are ye come out as against a thief?" You yourselves are doing a deed of darkness which will not bear the light of day and the knowledge of the people.

Thus Jesus speaks, when arrested, on the matter of arrests. He shows the right, while submitting to the wrong. He defends justice and law with energy and ability, and yields up himself.

He was now several hours in the hands of those who took him, enduring their abuse and the denial of Peter; and then at earliest dawn (Luke xxii. 66), was placed before the assembled Sanhedrim, the highest Jewish court. This court consisted of seventy members, and was presided over by the high priest. (Matth. xxvi. 57.)

This is a situation entirely new. Jesus is alone in the midst of his enemies, who are also his judges, who thirst for his blood,

and want only the forms of law to cover their violence. It was a situation calculated to appall and disconcert a prisoner. How did Jesus act in this trying situation?

There was manifest at once an awkward position of affairs. The court was constituted, the prisoner was at the bar, but no prosecutor appeared with charges against him. The attention of Jesus' enemies had been hitherto engrossed by the effort to secure his person. They must now procure material for an accusation. The quickest method appears to be, to interrogate the prisoner.

"The high priest then asked Jesus of his disciples and his doctrine. Jesus answered him, I spake openly to the world: I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold they know what I said." (John xviii. 19-21.)

These first words of Jesus before the Jewish court, are mighty in legal argument. His positions are these: A prisoner should not be asked to inculcate himself, especially one whose whole life has been in public: Those who have seen and heard him should be called to testify concerning him; and such do right when, being called on, they testify to facts: A man's past life should be his defence or his condemnation: A court ought not to seek by interrogating a prisoner for new matter of accusation: Such a proceeding is malicious and tyrannical.

Thus Jesus planted himself on great principles of law and justice, exposed the illegality and wrong of which the Judge was guilty, and challenged the production of competent witnesses against himself. He was legally master of the situation. This was so manifest and so embarrassing, that one of the subordinate officers slapped Jesus in the face, or on the cheek, saying, Answerest thou the high priest so? (John xviii. 22.) The court permitted the outrage. Jesus, not driven from his propriety, nor confused with regard to his rights, nor deterred from maintaining them, but quick in seizing an advantage, exposing a wrong, and making a retort, said,

"If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?" (John xviii. 23.)

That is: If what he had said to the high priest was wrong, it would furnish the desired ground for a charge. Bear witness then of the evil I have been guilty of, and thereby relieve the embarrassment of the court, which is waiting for an accusation against me. But if I was right, then your blow was unmerited, and was simple abuse of a prisoner, who is under the protection of the court. How quick—how pointed—and legally how silencing! Jesus is still master of the situation. The court feels it, and yielding to the pressure, adopts the course which Jesus pointed out as the right one, namely, the production of witnesses.

"Now the chief priests and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death. But found none. Yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last, came two false witnesses, and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God and to build it in three days." "But neither so did their witness agree together." (Matth. xxvi. 59–61. Mark xiv. 59.)

And so long as testimony is being taken, Jesus is silent. He has no objection to make. And he has no occasion to interpose; for the whole proceeding breaks down of itself. Among the thousands who have daily seen and heard him, two witnesses cannot be found to testify as to one word or act which can be construed into a crime. The effort to make out an accusation in this way is necessarily abandoned. The prisoner should have been promptly discharged.

But the court does not mean to let its victim escape. The high priest, foiled in his second, returns to his first method of procedure, that, namely, of interrogating the criminal. "And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace." (Matth. xxvi. 62, 63.)

Jesus' silence is expressive—it is that of unassailable right. He had three good reasons for not answering. First, the testimony was not sustained, as this new resort to interrogation

of the prisoner admitted. Second, the interrogation itself was wrong, as Jesus had shown before. Thirdly, Jesus knew well its artful and malicious design, and he was not called to be the tool of their malice against himself. "So, he held his peace and answered nothing." (Mark xiv. 61.) He understands both the proprieties and the expedencies of his situation.

Now, therefore, the Judge, driven to extremity, made a last effort.

"The high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: what further need have we of witnesses? behold now ye have heard his blasphemy: what think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death." (Matth. xxvi. 63-66.)

If we look at the course of Jesus, in this last scene in the Jewish court, simply in the light of legal rules, we may feel some difficulty. He had been interrogated twice before by the Judge: the first time he objected, the second time, he said nothing. Now, interrogated a third time, he answers, and his answer is made the ground of his condemnation. We may perhaps say, that having in the first two instances shown the right, he, in the third, submits to the wrong. Leaving this point for the present, we notice in this case the use of a judicial oath. Jesus was put under oath, and answered his judge under oath. We have then his example in regard to oaths in courts of law, in answering under oath at the bar of justice, in speaking the truth under oath, in swearing to one's own hurt, and altering not. We may, perhaps, put this answer of Jesus in the category of the confession of the truth before the tribunals of persecuting powers, and regard it as an example of the right course for those who should in all ages be brought before kings and rulers for his name's sake. When the alternative is presented (having not been sought,



but in the use of all right legal means avoided), when the necessity comes either by word to deny the truth, or by silence to disown it, or boldly to confess it before men, then the duty of the loyal Christian is to do as Jesus did—confess—though death must follow. Thus the faithful have done in all ages, having Jesus' example, and having also his promise, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in heaven."

We feel, however, that the course pursued by Jesus at this point cannot be fully explained, either by the rules of law, or on the principle of the open confession of the truth. The action has, we conceive, a higher significance, and more interesting relations. Take Jesus in the character which he here claims, as Christ the Son of God, and what are the parties and the situation in the scene before us? The high priests of Aaron's line have run their career as figures of the true. The last of them is in his seat, and has reached the last moment and the last valid act of his office. He is now to give place to the true and eternal High Priest, who is before him in the person of the prisoner. The highest ecclesiastical and civil council of the nation is in formal session, having been called together to act in this very case. This same high priest had shortly before, not speaking of himself, "prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation and for all the people of God." (John xi. 47-52, and xviii. 14.) And now, also, not speaking of himself, nor knowing the sacred import of the action, he requires Jesus, swearing "by the living God," to say whether he is the Christ, the son of God. Jesus understands the full import of the moment and the action: He therefore answers with an explicit affirmative, declaring himself to be the Son of God. As such he assumes formally before them the office and the duties of his high priesthood, and is thereupon adjudged by them to die, ostensibly as a blasphemer, but really as they intend, and as God intends, "for the people."

If this view of the transaction be correct, there was reason enough why Jesus should answer the judge even according to human rules of inauguration and investiture. The action was

not, in the strict sense, a legal one, but in the highest sense an official and governmental one. They "were made priests without an oath, but this with an oath," on earth as well as in heaven.

Jesus, having thus formally and before the highest authorities of the church, taken on himself his priesthood, submits quietly to the consequence. Having been condemned, and barbarously insulted and abused, he was "led away to Pilate," the Roman Governor, that the sentence of the ecclesiastical court may be confirmed and executed by the civil power.

Now, therefore, we have Jesus before a Roman court, there to pass again through the ordeal of a trial. Roman law and Roman courts of law stand higher than those of any other ancient people. How will Jesus, alone, without advocate or counsel, deport himself there?

As the charge of blasphemy against God will not weigh much at a Roman tribunal, the enemies of Jesus dextrously change their ground. "We found this fellow (they say) perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ a king." (Luke xxiii. 2.)

"Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall, and called Jesus and said unto him, Art thou the king of the Jews? What hast thou done? Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. Pilate saith unto him, What is truth? And when he had said this he went out again unto the Jews, and saith unto them, I find in him no fault at all." (John xviii. 33, 35-38.)

This interrogation of the prisoner, if an official act at all, seems to have been only a preliminary one: the process itself is spoken of (Matth. xxvii. 12-14.) Pilate's object in the inquiry was to get information in regard to the case. It gave

Jesus the opportunity to make known his true character, and so his grounds of defence against the charge of the Jews; and he used the opportunity to this end. Answering in the free style of conversation, he appealed to his appearance and his want of supporters. Was this the style of a dangerous pretender to earthly royalty? He was a king—but not of an earthly kingdom—not one who interfered with existing civil powers. He was king of the Truth—a moral and religious teacher—ready to be the guide of every sincere seeker after truth.

By this explanation of himself, Jesus relieved the mind of his Roman judge from all grounds of suspicion. He set himself right where he was liable to be misunderstood injuriously. His kingship was a nice point to discuss with the Roman authorities; but he succeeded in making it understood. Pilate, an intelligent man of the world, acquainted with men and affairs, perhaps not altogether unread in Greek and Roman literature, nor entirely unacquainted with schools and teachers of philosophy and religion, seeing also the appearance and bearing of his prisoner, understands him and his accusers entirely, knows that he had been delivered up for envy, when entirely innocent of all seditious designs, and going out to the Jews, declares Jesus free of all fault. Thus Jesus has gained his cause, nay, received from his judge a public acknowledgment of his innocence.

Henceforth, therefore, through all the successive scenes of his experience, up to the moment of his being delivered to be crucified, Jesus was entirely silent. Even in the investigation proper, "accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing." (Matth. xxvii. 12.) And when Pilate said, "Hearst thou not how many things they witness against thee," Jesus "answered him to never a word, insomuch that the governor marveled greatly." (Matth. xxvii. 13, 14.) He had made his cause clear to the mind of the judge, and awaited now the proof of the charge made by them, or its rejection, by the judge himself in accordance with his previous declaration, or he was ready for the issue whatever it might be.\* Pilate also

sent him to Herod, and Herod "questioned with him in many words; but he answered nothing." (Luke xxiii. 9.) There was no occasion for his speaking; for Pilate, giving a history of all these proceedings, says, "I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him; no, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him; and lo, nothing worthy of death is found in him." (Luke xxiii. 14, 15.) The judge himself becomes an earnest pleader in his behalf. He offers to chastise him for their gratification, and then release him (Luke xxiii. 16); endeavors to take advantage in his behalf of the custom of releasing a prisoner at the feast (John xviii. 39); and foiled in this, spake "a third time, Why, what evil hath he done? I have found no cause of death in him." (Luke xxiii. 22.) And finally, "he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person." (Matth. xxvii. 24.) Certainly one on trial thus acquitted, defended, pleaded for by his judge, need not say a word in his own defence.

But Jesus did speak once more in answer to Pilate, in a final interview, which also appears to have been no part of the proper legal proceedings. The Jews, seeing Pilate so unwilling, to carry out their wishes, bring every possible means to bear upon him, and urge with the rest their own condemnation of him for blasphemy. "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the son of God." (John xix. 7.) Pilate, awe-struck at this high claim of the prisoner, "went again into the judgment hall and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer." Then saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee? Jesus answered, Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." (John xix. 8-11.)

Jesus replied not at first, for the question of the judge seemed to be a reopening of the case which he himself had so emphatically closed. The judge may swerve from the right

rule of procedure, Jesus will, by his silence, both maintain the right himself, and give a lesson to the judge. A prisoner acquitted, has nothing to do but await his discharge. At this silence of Jesus, Pilate coolly reminds him that it would be wise to treat his judge with deference, as his life and death were in his power. Jesus now replies, but not as a party on trial, nor simply as a party acquitted, but almost as the Final Judge of all. "God, by his providence, has put me in your hand, and for the exercise of your power you are responsible to him, and guilty too. But they are more guilty who are using you and your power to effect my death." A reply this, dignified, solemn and tender; a warning to his judge, who was just then yielding to pressure contrary to his conscience; a protest against the whole proceeding as malicious, and unjust; and thus a fit close of that which Jesus saw fit to do and to say, when taken and tried and condemned by the ecclesiastical and the civil courts.

In order now to make a proper estimate of the facts reviewed as they bear upon the object of our inquiry, we must keep in mind that Jesus did not, in these proceedings, act simply in the character of a citizen at the bar of justice. Even as such he might prefer, as have many other good men, to sacrifice personal rights and interests for the sake of objects deemed by him more important. Also, though in the hands of his enemies, he still acted upon occasion, as healer and spiritual guide of men. As High Priest also, nay, as the Lamb of God, self-devoted to sacrifice, he must present himself to our view in these scenes in aspects and acts extra-legal, and that too in closest connection with those which are of a strictly legal character. It was, for instance, no part of his plan to secure a final release. His words to Peter, when being found, "The cup which my Father giveth me, shall I not drink it?" show that he knew and accepted his fate. The higher objects and bearings of the sufferings and acts of Jesus Christ almost overshadow, by their importance and interest, these which we are considering.

But with all the abatements and modifications from these and other causes, the fact of a controlling influence of the great rules and principles of criminal law in the course of Jesus in his arrest and trials, is, I think, manifest. He does not appear in the history as a helpless sufferer accepting whatever may come; nor yet as a legal novice in the hands of shrewd and practiced men-at-law. He lays hold at each point of the great principles and rules of law applicable to the case, and presents and urges them with effect, exposing thereby the wrong course of his captors and of his judges. The points he makes, embrace in fact the elements of a true legal defence. Not once does he take a position which is legally wrong. If he fails to press any point of law to the utmost extent in his own behalf, it was not because he had not the necessary knowledge and ability. He was, as has already been said, master, legally, of the situation.

Such, then, are the facts as they appear in the history. Jesus understood, approved and used in his own case the great principles and rules of criminal law which are found embodied in the judicial systems of the civilized world.

Now, if this was so, we may reasonably ask, How is the past to be explained? "How knew this man the law, having never learned?" Grown up among the peasants of Galilee, having associated all his life with the common people, a healer and religious teacher, a man of peace, having probably never before been in a court of justice, "whence had this man this wisdom?"

They who cherish a deep reverence, and a sincere admiration for the law, its principles and institutions, may perhaps find that our examination throws new light on the character and the origin of the man of Nazareth: and those who believe that "Jesus is the Son of God," may, from the course which he pursued when taken and tried, be led to just conclusions in regard to the law and its institutions. He evidently came not to destroy the civil law—nay, by his example and conduct he established the law. In connection with all his other teachings and works of wisdom, power and love, while on the

earth, we have his instructions here also, and as to all other points they are worthy of the Son of God, the Maker and Ruler and final Judge of men.

This side of the character, and this part of the history and teaching of Christ, deserve a fuller study and an abler exposition. Many just remarks on the subject lie scattered in our biblical and Christian literature; but the whole ground should be examined, and the materials digested by a master hand. A Christian lawyer, one familiar with the principles and antiquities of his profession, and also at home in biblical studies, might thus assist the exegesis of the Bible in one of its most interesting parts, and do honor both to the civil law, and to the character and perfection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

---

✓ ART. III.—THE SANDWICH ISLANDS MISSION, AND ITS  
CALUMNIATORS.

By REV. JOSEPH TRACY, D.D.

IN the year 1810, there was published at Oxford, in England, a volume of 190 octavo pages, entitled: "A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review against Oxford; containing an Account of Studies pursued at that University." No author's name graced the title-page; but it was well understood to be the work of a Professor of Poetry in that University, and to be published with the approbation of his colleagues in the Faculty.

The Review had said—alluding to Oxford—"Where the dictates of Aristotle are still listened to as infallible decrees, or where the infancy of science is mistaken for its maturity, the mathematical sciences have never flourished, and the scholar has no means of advancing beyond the mere elements of Geometry." And yet it was compelled to acknowledge, in its rejoinder: "We are aware that Oxford has to boast of Wallis, Gregory and Halley among its Professors, and that a



successor worthy of them is still found in the same University." The Review had also, in criticizing an Oxford edition of Strabo, spoken disparagingly of the Greek scholarship of that University.

Should not the vast services which Oxford had rendered to the cause of good learning for a thousand years,\* the names of such professors as Wallis, Gregory and Halley, and the acknowledgment that they had then "a successor worthy of them," have been a sufficient reply to such a "calumny?" So many would have reasoned; but Oxford thought it better to defend herself by a formal, printed and published reply.

We assume that this is a respectable precedent. We assume also, that "His Grace the Lord Bishop of Oxford," "His Grace the Lord Bishop of Honolulu," and their associates, when they address public meetings, and write under their own signatures, professing to state facts, are as likely to be believed, and to injure those against whom they bear witness, as anonymous writers in a Scotch review. If these assumptions are correct, we are fully justified in replying to the "calumnies" of their "Graces" against the American Mission in the Sandwich Islands; even though the good character of the missionaries, and the good influence of their labors are as notorious as was the existence of respectable scholarship at Oxford in 1810. We tender this as our apology to our readers, for laying before them some proofs of facts which have long been well known to the whole Christian world, and to the missionaries, for writing anything which may be made to seem to imply, that their characters need any defense.

But are the calumnies against that mission of sufficient importance, in respect to the matters charged, to justify a reply?

Bishop Staley, of Honolulu, in the Appendix to his Pastoral Address, "delivered in his church on new years day, 1865," says, that the "Hawaiian type" of "piety," taught by that mission, is "a species of unctuous cant and glib familiarity

---

\*Oxford claims to have been founded in A.D. 805, and revived, after the Danish Wars, by Alfred, in A.D. 886.

with sacred expressions, having no hold on the moral being." (p. 44). He asserts that "there was less of the fearful practice of polyandry and the corruption of girls in the heathen than in the Christian days of this people," and adds: "The change for the worse, I do not hesitate to say, has been greatly aided by Puritanism." (p. 51). In an address in the church of the Incarnation, in New York, he is reported, in one of the newspapers of that city, to have said, that "the morality of the Islands in Christian days is ten times worse than it was under heathenism." Being called to account for that assertion, he published a card, denying the accuracy of the report, and claimed to have said only about the same that we have quoted from his Pastoral Address. Upon this, the reporter publicly re-affirmed the accuracy of his report, and in that form it has gone out to the world, as Bishop Staley's testimony concerning the mission. And the *Colonial Church Journal* asserts that the labors of our Missionaries have "ended in failure, so far as the moral and religious character of the Hawaiians is concerned."\*

If these statements are true,—if they are not "calumnies," the mission is a failure, a sham, and a nuisance. If they are believed, the reputation of the mission, and its usefulness, so far as it depends on its reputation, are at an end. In respect to the nature and gravity of the charges, then, the call for a reply is as complete as it possibly can be.

In claiming that the good character and usefulness of that mission are as evident as that there is respectable scholarship at Oxford, we do not state the case too strongly. Look at the facts: and first, in respect to religion.

When the first missionaries arrived, in April, 1820, the people of these Islands had, outwardly, no religion. They had been idolaters; but they had discarded their idols, burned or torn down their temples, and abolished the whole system as a visible institution; and they had adopted nothing in its place. The superstitions connected with their former idolatry still

---

\* *Journal* for July, 1866, page 267.

haunted their minds, and tortured their hearts, and debased their morals.

The Missionaries began their work. In three years, they received one convert, Keopuolani, to the communion of the church. At the end of twelve years, they had received 577; in the next ten years, 22,651; in the next ten years, 12,325; and in the next ten, 8,802. No one who has any acquaintance with the work of collecting statistics, will suppose that these numbers are perfectly accurate; but they are as nearly so as carefully compiled statistics usually are, and any inaccuracy in them must be too small to affect the argument. These numbers, added together, make 51,556 admissions to full communion. Meanwhile, in forty years, the deaths of communicants reported and recorded had been more than 20,000; about 8,000 had been ex-communicated, many of whom had not been restored to the communion; and about 1,500 had, without change of faith or practice, been formed into a distinct organization.

In 1850, according to an official census, the native population was 82,203. According to the average annual rate of diminution for fourteen years then ending, it was 85,691 in 1848. The number of communicants that year was 23,796, or 27.77 to 100 of the whole native population. Calculating on the same principle, the native population in 1856 was 69,051. The communicants were 23,652, or 34.25 in a 100. On the same principle, we find the native population in 1863 to have been 65,653. The communicants were then, counting the 1,500 seceders mentioned above, 21,179, or 32.26 in 100.

And here it seems expedient to mention expressly, what all who are acquainted with Puritan churches know already, that these communicants were not persons who had merely been baptized, and therefore counted as church members. The number who had been baptized, including the children of communicants, was much greater. Nor were they merely persons who, after baptism, had learned to repeat certain forms of words, and practice or submit to certain ceremonies. They were all of them persons who, after examination, had been

deemed by the churches to be persons spiritually renewed in the temper of their minds ; men and women who had given such accounts of their own thoughts and feelings in respect to themselves and religion, that they appeared to the communicants, who were their neighbors, and knew their characters for intelligence and veracity, to have repented of their sins, and to have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, as the Scriptures require in order to salvation, and to give satisfactory evidence of the reality of that change by Puritan strictness of morals and Puritan habits of devotion, and who, after their admission, continued to exhibit the same evidence of Puritan piety—as otherwise they would have been cut off by excommunication.

To these, in order to estimate the whole number of Protestants in connection with the mission, must be added the number, often large, especially in the Sandwich Islands, who exhibited some indications of piety, but in whom, in their own judgment, or that of the church, the evidences of regeneration were not yet sufficiently developed to warrant their admission to the communion. We must add, also, large numbers of those who, though not supposed by themselves or others to have been the subjects of any spiritual change, yet admitted the truth of the doctrines taught by the missionaries, were more or less punctual in attendance on their instructions, and considered themselves members of their congregations. And yet again, we must add the yet unregenerate children of the communicants, who had generally been baptized, and the yet unbaptized children of the other classes just mentioned.

According to Dr. Mullen's "Statistical Tables for India and Ceylon in 1862," quoted by Rev. W. Ellis, the native Christians were 153,816 ; communicants, 30,249, or 19-66 in 100. In the missions with which Mr. Ellis himself has been connected, the communicants have been 20 or 25 in 100 of the "adherents to Christianity" as taught by these missions. In New England Puritan parishes generally, we believe that not more than one-third of the parishioners, including children, are communicants. In many, the proportion is much less. Assum-

ing one-third as the proportion of communicants to "adherents," or "native Christians," the whole number of natives connected with the missions must have been 71,388 out of a native population of 85,691 in 1848. In 1856, it must, on the same assumption, have been 70,956, while the native population was only 69,051; so that more than one-third must then have been communicants. In 1863, the number of "native Christians" connected with both branches of the mission must have been 63,537, out of a native population of 65,653; leaving 2,116 natives not under the instruction of the mission. Evidently in 1856, there had been large additions to the number of the communicants, including many whom it was afterwards found necessary to excommunicate. In 1865, the communicants, further reduced by deaths and excommunications, were reported as being 17,521. Counting both branches, and supposing both to have diminished in the same proportion, the whole number was 18,855, out of a native population of 63,699, or 29.6 in 100. The "native Christians" connected with both branches must have been about 56,565, if the communicants were only one-third of them; leaving 7,134 not under the instruction of the Puritan missionaries; either Roman Catholics, or Mormons, or adherents of the new "Reformed Catholic church," or unconnected with any church. Probably, however, many of them were persons who had been excommunicated, but were still under the care of the mission.

We repeat the remark, that these statistics may be slightly inaccurate. Among the communicants, some, though very few, may have been of foreign birth. Some admissions, excommunications and deaths, may have failed to be promptly recorded or reported. There may have been errors in the official census taken by the government. But there is no reason to suspect any greater errors than usually attend official statistics, collected and published in good faith. They show, beyond plausible cavil, that the people of the Islands had very generally attached themselves to the Puritan missionaries as their religious teachers, and that an unusually large proportion of them were communicants in the churches; members of these Puritan churches, "in good and regular standing."

Whatever any may think of Puritanism, whether it be good or bad, the gospel of Christ or "another gospel," the mission had been successful in teaching it. The missionaries, and those who sustained them, believed it to be the gospel of Christ in its purest and most efficient form. Their object was, to bring those Islanders to a hearty adoption of it as their religion, as the best means of promoting their well-being, both in time and in eternity. By the blessing of God on their labors, as they believed, and not by the help of the Devil, they had brought nearly the whole population of the Islands to think it worth learning, and put themselves under their instruction, and nearly one-third, a proportion scarcely paralleled in the history of missions, so to adopt it as to produce, in the judgment of those most competent to judge, a radical change of character. Their enterprise, in respect to its main object, instead of having been a failure, has been a most remarkable success.

And this success has been achieved in the face of a most violent, unscrupulous and persistent opposition. From the beginning, it had been opposed by immoral foreigners, chiefly English and American, because they hated the Puritan morality which it practiced and taught. It was opposed by some British subjects, because it was American and not British, and its success, they feared, might promote American interests, to the detriment of British.

Through their procurement, a Roman Catholic mission was commenced in 1827. The Jesuit missionaries, according to their own official reports, published in the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith," managed to land and remain on the Islands by fraud and duplicity from the first; and after some of them had been sent to their brethren in California, permission for their residence was extorted from the government by French cannon. They have always been the bitter and unscrupulous opposers of the American mission. How many proselytes they have made, we have no means of estimating. From their own account of their own character for veracity, just mentioned, it is obvious that no reliance can be placed on

their statements. They count, as "Catholics," all whom they have baptized, and baptize all who are willing to receive that rite from them, whatever may be their characters. Such is their practice everywhere and always. Since that mission was commenced, the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith" has given an account of some thousands of infants, made Catholics in the interior of China, by a process which it pronounced "beautiful." Certain women, whose religion was not known to their neighbors, professed skill in medicine; and when an infant appeared to be at the point of death, presented themselves, and requested permission, which was readily granted, to perform a short ceremony, to ensure the favorable effect of their medicine. The ceremony consisted in repeating the form of baptism in Latin, which none present understood, and sprinkling a little water on the sick child. In this way, according to the "Annals," the souls of many thousands of infants had been saved within a few years. Of course, if any of these infants lived, they were counted as members of the Roman Catholic church, though neither they nor their neighbors suspected it. How many such "beautiful" baptisms may have been performed in the Sandwich Islands, we know not. We know that some have joined them who had been excommunicated from the Puritan churches for immorality, and some who could not gain admission to them; and such have taken their children with them. If they have made any other proselytes, the fact has not come to our knowledge. Their bishop, in 1862, reckoned the whole population at 69,000, of whom 23,000 were "Catholics," 23,000 "heretics," and 23,000 "infidels."\* By "heretics," he evidently means communicants in the Puritan churches, whose number he has given with an approach towards accuracy unusual in a Roman Catholic missionary. The other members of the Puritan congregations are his 23,000 "infidels." Thus he gives the Puritans two-thirds of the population, and claims one-third for his

---

\* According to another statement, Catholics, 23,500, Heretics, 23,500, Infidels, 23,300.



own church ; a claim utterly incredible, unless on the supposition of numerous secret baptisms, like those in China. The most credible estimate that we have seen, makes the Romanists about one-tenth as numerous as the Protestants : say five or six thousand.

Much later, we know not the exact date, came the Mormons. Their leading man in October, 1861, officially reported the number of Mormon adults at 3,580, besides 1,000 unbaptized minors over seven years of age. As their principal settlement is on the small grazing island of Lanai, which, in 1860, had only 646 inhabitants, having increased 46 in seven years, his statement must be an enormous exaggeration. Perhaps so many, by estimate, had at some time heard Mormon elders preach, or had traded with Mormons, or done something else for which they were claimed and counted.

Yet it is plain that, after deducting the probable number of Romanists and Mormons from the whole native population, the remainder will not be three times the number of Puritan communicants. Of the eight or nine-tenths of the native population of the Islands, who could not be enticed away from the instruction of the Puritan missionaries, more than one-third were members of Puritan churches, "in good and regular standing." As we have already stated, they had been admitted after examination as to their character for religious knowledge, piety and morality, and had practiced Puritan piety and morality so far as not to be excommunicated ; though the discipline had been so severe as to excommunicate about 8,000 of those who had been admitted ; so severe that some of those Puritan missionaries themselves, on reflection, feared that it had been too strict ; so severe that the maligners of the mission hold it up to public abhorrence, as imposing unreasonable and intolerable restraints on the inclinations of the people. It is plain, therefore, that in the extent to which the Puritan mission had, in the face of all opposition and competition, secured the confidence of the people, and in the power of its teachings over the minds and lives of its adherents, the mission had been remarkably successful ; immensely

more successful than any mission attempted by its assailants dares pretend to have been. The facts leave no opening for any objection against the mission's work, except objections against Puritanism itself.

Next, what have been the facts, concerning the influence of the mission on morals?

If the morals of Puritanism are better than those of Heathenism, what has already been shown is a sufficient answer. The facts that nearly one-third of the people maintain their regular standing in the Puritan churches, notwithstanding the conceded strictness of their discipline, and that far the greater part of the remaining two-thirds are firm adherents of the Puritan teachers, show a moral influence very great and very beneficial. But we need not rely on this exclusively.

When the mission commenced, idolatry had been demoralizing this people for many centuries, and was rapidly extinguishing it in the poison of its own vices. They had no idea of any God who loves righteousness and hates iniquity, and of course, no idea of a future retribution for good or evil deeds. "The long darkness of heathenism had swept away both the idea and the name of a Supreme Being, and had effectually annihilated from their minds all his attributes, leaving no just notion of holiness, justice, love or mercy, and had buried in oblivion every term expressive of even the simple sentiments of honesty and morality." Their language "was incapable of expressing, without much ambiguity and confusion, the common notions of right and wrong."\* Their only rule of action, except their own inclinations, was the "thought," that is, the expressed will, of some chief, or the fear of some enemy. Gaming, drunkenness, theft, robbery and murder were common. The licentious intercourse of the sexes was unbounded. Men had several wives at the same time, and wives several husbands; and both changed them at their pleasure. This licentiousness was not introduced by foreigners. The first discoverers found it there. Some of the male

---

\*Dibble's Sandwich Islands, p. iii.

chiefs proposed to get the iron on board of the ships by robbery ; but Kamakahelai, a woman of high rank, proposed another way to obtain it. She sent her own daughter, Selamahoalani, and other women on board, to get it by "gratifying" the strangers. And thus this vicious intercourse with foreigners began. Capt. Cook was desirous to prevent it ; but, "if the discipline of his own crew could have been strictly enforced, the eagerness of the women was not to be repressed."\* So thoroughly imbued was the native mind with this vice, that neither men nor women could refuse an invitation to practice it, without feeling that the refusal was an act of meanness, to be ashamed of.† As might be expected when such were the relations of the sexes, infanticide was common. "It is estimated by foreigners who came first among the people, and had the best opportunity of judging, that at least two-thirds of the infants born, perished by the hands of their own parents."‡

An important witness, long resident among them, and with good means of information, thus sums up "the Hawaiian character in its general caste," admitting, however, a few "instances of a better disposition :"

"From childhood, no pure social affections were inculcated. Existence was due rather to accident than design. If spared by a parent's hand, a boy lived to become the victim of a priest, an offering to a blood-loving duty, or to experience a living death from preternatural fears ; a slave not only to his own superstitions, but to the terrors and caprices of his chief. He was not to know freedom either in life or property ; but in its stead a pitiless tyranny, reaping where it had not sown. To him existed no social circle to purify by kindly affections ; no moral teachings enkindled a love of truth ; no revelation cheered his earthly course, or brightened his future hopes. Theft, lying, drunkenness, revelling, treachery, revenge, lewdness, infanticide and murder were familiar to his youth, and too often became the practice of his manhood. Guilt was measured by success or failure. Justice was but retaliation,

---

\* Jarves, p. 57. Bingham, p. 31. † Dibble, p. 127. ‡ Dibble, p. 128.

and the law arrayed each man's hand against his brother. Games and amusements were but means of gambling and sensual excitement. An individual selfishness which sought present gratification, momentary pleasure or lasting results, regardless of unholy measures or instruments, was the all-pre-dominating passion. The most attractive quality of the Hawaiian—it cannot be called a virtue, was a kind of easy, listless good-nature, never to be depended upon when their interests or passions were aroused.”\*

When the mission was commenced, idol-worship had just been abolished, and the danger of being offered in sacrifice at the dictation of a priest, no longer existed; though an indefinite fear of the priest's vengeance still remained. In other respects, the description was still applicable.

And what is the state of morals there now? Is it, as “His Grace, the Lord Bishop of Honolulu” said at New York, “ten times worse?” Can “His Grace” form any idea of a state of morals “ten times worse?” If he can, must he not have a mind strangely fertile in the production of vile ideas? If not, must he not be a man who brings damaging charges against his neighbor, without affixing any definite meaning to his own words? But let us look at the facts.

As the Islands have now a regular government, printed statutes, and courts of judicature, which are courts of record, we may ascertain some of the facts on official testimony. We have before us the Biennial Report of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for 1860; about the time when the mission of Bishop Staley was planned. From this it appears that the whole number of convictions for crime before all the Courts in the whole kingdom had been 4,007 in 1857; 3,364 in 1858; and 3,284 in 1859. Of these, 1,919 in 1857, 1,730 in 1858, and 1,573 in 1859, had been for drunkenness, which the Government would have suppressed very effectually, but for the introduction of French wines and brandies at the mouth of French cannon, by order of the French Government; having 2,088 in 1857,

---

\*Jarves, p. 51.

1,614 in 1858, and 1,531 in 1859, as the number of convictions for other crimes. Of these convictions, the most numerous—589 in 1859, were for “adultery and fornication.” If both parties were punished, as they ought to have been, and as the law requires, the whole number of instances of these crimes, judicially ascertained in the whole kingdom, was less than 300. Our readers, if we happen to have any in England, where adultery and seduction are no crimes, but merely trespasses, like injuries to any domestic animal, for which the trespasser is liable to pay to the injured husband or father such an amount of £. s. d. as a jury shall adjudge the damage to have been, may be surprised to learn that there were any convictions for such acts. But they should recollect that the Hawaiian criminal code, being prompted by a Puritan religion, is of a higher and stricter type than the English, and makes every transgression of the Seventh commandment a crime, punishable by law. It is a direct result of their being taught their religion by those whom “His Grace” the Bishop of Oxford calls “the descendants of the stern old Puritans of New England, if any thing, rather more severe, sour and vinegar-like, carrying with them the iron code of Connecticut, the most severe ever inflicted upon any people on the earth ;” and their strictness against this very sin has been the principal provocation of those calumnies against the mission, which “His Grace” has seen fit to sanction with his Episcopal authority, and circulate at second hand—we hope, without understanding them.

Of the 942 other convictions in 1859, 185 were for assault and battery, 86 for affray, 5 for aiding seamen to desert, 1 for arson, 9 for burglary, 6 for cruelty to animals, 33 for disturbing quiet of the night, 57 for disorderly conduct, 2 for forgery, 123 for furious riding, 11 for gross cheating, 24 for gambling, 167 for larceny, 19 for petty larceny, 8 for murder, 8 for perjury, 4 for profanity, 14 for riot, 38 for Sabbath-breaking, 1 for selling on Sunday, 5 for vagrancy, and the others for various offences.

How much of this immorality was due to the presence of

foreign seamen, the Report does not inform us; but the proportion must have been large. In 1863, the foreign arrivals noticed in the Custom House Reports were, ships of war, 7; merchantmen, 88; whalers, 102; total, 197. The crews of all these vessels must have their time on shore, in which to compensate themselves by indulgence on land for months of restraint and privation at sea. Every body knows the demoralizing influence of such causes in London, Liverpool, New York; and in the comparatively small ports of the Pacific, where seamen commonly arrive after long voyages, they must operate with much greater intensity. Make fair deductions on this account, and then compare the result with equally minute and accurate returns from England herself, (if you can get them) and then say, whether Bishop Staley needed to leave his native land, to find a field for his labors in the cause of good morals, in the Sandwich Islands. Recall to mind the state of this people in respect to morals when the Puritan mission began its labors, and say whether, in this respect, that mission has been a failure, or a success.

With this official record before us, we shall not dwell upon the testimony of the Hon. R. H. Dana, an Episcopalian, of unquestioned Christian character, a lawyer, whose large acquirements, extensive practice, and various travels, have rendered him an unusually competent judge, and who says: "In no place in the world that I have visited, are the rules which control vice and regulate amusements so strict, yet so reasonable and so fairly enforced." "As to the interior, it is well known that a man may travel alone, with money, in the wildest spots, unarmed." We shall just mention that of Dr. Anderson: "I did not see a drunken native while on the Islands. The law forbids polygamy and polyandry, and they have passed away. Theft and robbery are less frequent there than in the United States. We slept at night with open doors, had no apprehension, and lost nothing. Licentiousness still exists outside of the church, and is one of the easily-besetting sins within it; but it now every where shuns the day, and is subjected to the discipline of the church. Nor do mothers

any more bury their infant children alive, nor children their aged and infirm parents."

But we must notice briefly, the latest proof that we have seen, that the labors of the American Missionaries have "ended in failure, so far as the moral and religious character of the Hawaiians is concerned."\* The proof is, that certain statistics, collected by Mr. Manley Hopkins, show "that the number on the register of "public women" is 1-8 per cent. of the whole female population above 20; and that of those so registered, two-thirds are married women, some of whom continue to live with their husbands while leading a life of vice and infamy." "Two-thirds of the abandoned women are married persons! The thing is incredible, were it not attested."

On an arithmetical question, it is not wise to be frightened by an exclamation point. Let us look at this matter with calmness and care.

When the American Mission commenced its labors, all the women on the Islands were such as are now called "abandoned." They all lived what is now reckoned "a life of vice and infamy," even while living with their two or three husbands each, and their husbands, with very few exceptions, if any, did not object to it. Kamahamaha, it is said, wished to keep Kawhumanu to himself; but that was one of that remarkable man's peculiarities, and his prohibition does not appear to have included his other wives. Indeed, there is no reason to suppose that the idea of chastity, as understood throughout Christendom, existed in any Hawaiian mind. Now, "abandoned women" are "registered," and thus distinguished from others, as "leading a life of vice and infamy." This, itself, whatever the proportion so registered may be, shows a mighty advance towards universal purity. This one fact shows that the labors of the mission have not "ended in failure."

But let us look at the proportions. It does not appear why the number "registered" is compared with the whole num-

---

\* *Colonial Church Chronicle*, London, July, 1836, pp. 267, 270.



ber above 20, making the proportion greater than if compared with the number above 18, or 16, or 14. There is some ground for suspicion, too, that these statistics really relate only to Honolulu, where the influence of foreign sailors is most pernicious, and not to the whole kingdom, as this writer seems to represent. But let all that pass. Consider, that 1.8 per cent is 18 in 1,000; and two-thirds of that number is 12 in 1,000. When the American Mission arrived, of 1,000 Hawaiian women, all were unchaste. Now, 18 of them are "abandoned women," and 982 of good character. Of the 18, "two-thirds," that is, 12, are "married women, some of whom," two or three perhaps, "continue to live with their husbands," and the rest have run away, or been deserted or discarded. What a change! Why, this alone is enough to pay for the "forty years' assiduous evangelizing—two entire generations born and bred in the Christian faith—public schools in every village—religious revivals almost every year—prayer-meetings innumerable," at which this writer sneers so loftily.

We repeat our challenge to the calumniators of the Mission. Let them show, if they can, that any mission of their own has been equally successful in promoting good morals. That the mission has been "a failure" in its influence on the intellect of the nation, its calumniators have shrunk from asserting. The facts are too palpable and too conclusive for even their audacity to brave. Bishop Staley himself says: "We have ever admitted the zeal and success of the Calvinist missionaries here, in spreading, partly by their own teaching, partly through the influence of the chiefs, that system which they believed to be the true gospel of Christ, in giving the nation a written language, in translating the Holy Scriptures, and in establishing schools." This concedes, that in its influence on the intellect of the nation, the mission has not been "a failure." It concedes, too, that in teaching what the missionaries believed to be the gospel, it has been no "failure." The attempt to take a part of the credit of this acknowledged "success" from the mission and transfer it to "the chiefs," is a palpable sophism, as the chiefs exerted no such influence till the missionaries taught them.

But let us again hear that very competent witness, Hon. R. H. Dana: "It is no small thing to say of the missionaries of the American Board, that in less than forty years they have taught this whole people to read and to write, to cipher and to sew. They have given them an alphabet, grammar and dictionary; preserved their language from extinction; given it a literature, and translated into it the Bible and works of devotion, science and entertainment, etc. etc. They have established schools, reared up native teachers, and so pressed their work, that now the proportion of inhabitants who can read and write, is greater than in New England; and whereas they found these Islanders a nation of half-naked savages, living in the surf and on the sand, eating raw fish, fighting among themselves, tyrannized over by feudal chiefs, and abandoned to sensuality, they now see them decently clothed, recognizing the law of marriage, knowing something of accounts, going to school and public worship with more regularity than the people do at home, and the more elevated of them taking part in conducting the affairs of the constitutional monarchy under which they live, holding seats on the judicial bench, and in the legislative chambers, and filling posts in the local magistracies." "In every district are free schools for natives. In these they are taught reading, writing, singing by note, arithmetic, grammar, and geography, by native teachers. At Lahainaluna is the Normal school for natives, where the best scholars from the district schools are received and carried to an advanced stage of education, and those who desire it, are fitted for the duties of teachers." He also mentions, with just commendations, several other institutions; especially the Royal School for natives at Honolulu, and the College at Punahon, where he attended recitations in Greek, Latin, and Mathematics, and advised the young men to remain to the end of the course, instead of going elsewhere in the hope of better instruction.

As to the education of "the more elevated," it would be enough, could we lay before the reader the debates in the Convention of 1864, for revising the Constitution of the king-

dom, where native delegates showed a thorough knowledge of the principles of free government, and replied impromptu to members born and educated in England, France, and Germany, reminding them of the state of affairs in their native countries. On a proposal to restrict the right of suffrage to those having a certain amount of property or income, as a means of stimulating those excluded to improve their condition, Mr. Wana reminded his English opponent, that the experiment had been tried in England for 240 years, and they had poor-houses there still. Another native member reminded a member born in France who favored some restriction on the press, that if he were editing a paper in his native land, he would be liable to a "warning" for his first indiscreet expression, and to seizure and confiscation if he persisted in saying what the government did not like. But our limited space forbids, and we will only give two samples of the results of the influence of the mission on Hawaiian mind, and give them in the words of its calumniators.

In an "Occasional Paper of the Hawaiian Church Mission," published at London, Oxford, and Cambridge in 1865, we are told (page 38) that His Majesty Kamehameha IV. translated "the English Prayer-Book into the native language," with a Preface, which was published by the Christian Knowledge Society, with an Introduction, containing the following words: "It was a work which he was very competent to execute; for he must not be thought of as an uncultivated barbarian: he was a man of dignified presence, and graceful and winning manners, with the education and habits of an English gentleman. He had special qualifications for the task which he undertook, in a perfect knowledge of English as well as of his own language, the previous habit of literary composition, and the possession of a considerable amount of theological knowledge." "It may be necessary to assure the reader that the Preface is entirely the King's own work." "It is a remarkable production, when we consider that the writer was in the third generation from the murderous savages with whom Captain Cook's voyages have made us familiar, and that he acquired his knowledge of the doctrines of the Church of Eng-

land entirely from his own reading, without any one to guide or help him."

And did the Puritan system of education enable him to find a Queen, who was a "help-meet for him?" Some time after his death, his widow visited England. The *London Saturday Review*, of September 9, 1865, says of her: "All who have met her, unite in describing Queen Emma as a person endowed with very remarkable gifts. No one who has read her history could have been unprepared to meet a character of great goodness and gentleness. But goodness and gentleness, we are thankful to believe, are not yet lost among the intricate mazes of the most artificial society, and are compatible with widely different degrees of social experience. What no one was quite prepared for in a traveler suddenly, and for the first time, transported from a quiet group of Pacific Islands into the vortex of European life, was that even and well-developed balance of high qualities in which nature and position combine to produce that rare creature, the real *grande dame*—the indescribable combination of self-forgetfulness and self-assertion, of dignity and simplicity, of personal grace and mutual tact, which constitutes true queendom."

And this is from an article which expresses the bitterest hatred of "the gospel according to the Pilgrim Fathers," and the most decided unwillingness that the Sandwich Islands, with their "commodious harbors," "at the midway" of the "magnificent commerce" of the Pacific, should be "gobbled up by omnivorous yankeedom." It was not written in a spirit friendly to the American Mission, or anything American; and yet it bears decisive testimony to the good influence of those missionaries as educators. There is an abundance of similar testimony concerning the same royal lady; but this is enough.

Yet we must not forget to confess, before leaving this topic, that Bishop Staley, in his Pastoral Address, 1865, (page 13) charges the American missionaries with one omission which we cannot deny; an omission, as he thinks, most injurious to the morals and piety of the people. "Their old athletic games and *hulas* were from the first *tabooed*." (Not the mission-

aries, but the chiefs, as soon as they had learned to understand and appreciate the distinction between virtue and vice, *tabooed* such amusements as they knew to be productive of the latter.) "I do not know enough of those *hulas* and those games, to be able to say how far they were right or wrong. I am told some of them were very licentious, while others led to gambling and dissipation. Be it so. Were Christian games and Christian dances taught in their place?"

We confess, they were not,—by the missionaries. No one of them, we presume, ever surmised that it was his duty to teach dancing. Very possibly, not one of them was competent to teach it; as we think there is no professor of the sedatory art in any of the theological seminaries where they were educated. The knowledge of waltzes, cotillions, and the like, has reached Honolulu in some way; but we believe the missionaries cannot claim the credit of introducing them. But is not Bishop Staley in the same condemnation? Does he teach a dancing-school? Does any one of his clergy? We have seen no statement to that effect. And if not, is he not afraid that his "system" will "endanger," as he says that of the Puritans has done, through this omission, "a fearful amount of unreality and hypocrisy?" We advise him to look to this matter, lest, knowing the duty of a missionary to the heathen, as the poor Puritans did not, and still neglecting to do it, he be "beaten with many stripes."

When a heathen nation is converted to genuine Christianity, a change in the social and civil structure of that nation is an inevitable result. Relations, and consequent duties, of rulers to people, of people to rulers, and of people to each other, of which they formerly had no idea, and for which their old heathen system made no provision, are revealed to them. Rulers desire to govern, and the people have to obey and support the government on Christian principles, and for Christian purposes. Old usages, seen to be unjust or injurious, are discontinued; and new usages, seen to be necessary for the general welfare, are introduced. These changes may go on gradually, till the new code of usages, sanctioned by time and the

national approbation, becomes the acknowledged constitution of the realm, as in England ; or the greatness and obvious urgency of the changes may be such, as to induce a deliberate reconsideration and re-arrangement of the whole frame-work of government, and the adoption of a new and written constitution, as in the Sandwich Islands. In such cases, especially of the latter kind, it is scarcely possible that the religious teachers, whose instructions have disclosed the want of a better form of government, should not be consulted as to the best methods of meeting that want. It has been so at the Sandwich Islands. The chiefs, as gradually enlightened by Christianity, first issued edicts, prohibiting certain immoralities ; then issued a few rules for preventing injustice between man and man, and between chiefs and their retainers ; and finally established the Constitution of a limited monarchy, with its King, House of Nobles, and House of Representatives elected by the people ; its Prime Minister, Secretaries of the Treasury and other Departments, and its supreme and subordinate Courts, administering justice according to a written code, enacted by legislative authority. The constitution has been several times revised and amended ; and some of the last amendments, in the opinion of many, both in that kingdom and elsewhere, were not improvements. Still, as it is now, it must be classed among the few good constitutions in the world. Few nations of Europe have one equally good ; and in none, perhaps, are the laws and their administration better adapted to the real wants of the people.

In accomplishing these changes, some of the missionaries have been consulted ; but they have sedulously abstained from interference, and have kept themselves aloof from this work as far as duty would permit. They doubtless knew, that among the benefactors of the human race, the judgment of the world assigns the highest ranks to legislators who are the founders of states. They were invited and urged to do that work, and earn that rank. But they had a still higher work to do ; a work which the world, by its wisdom, knew not ; the work of transforming ignorant, vicious, unprincipled heathens

into competent and conscientious legislators ; and they did it. In respect to this indirect but inevitable result, the mission has been a success.

And as a result of all this success in promoting good morals, good education and good government, the arts, the industries, and even the elegancies of civilized life have sprung up, have taken root, and are growing. Of this, proof enough to convince any thinking person, may be found in the Custom House Returns for 1865: Total imports, \$1,946,265,68 ; exports, \$1,808,257,55 ; the difference being, of course, the profits on exported articles sold abroad, during or near that year. Of the exports, \$1,430,211,82 were of Domestic Produce, the amount of which exported in 1864 was \$1,613,328,81 ; in 1863, \$744,413,54 ; in 1862, \$586,541,87 ; in 1861, \$476,872,74 ; showing a regular annual increase, which had continued, though with some irregularities, since 1846, when it was \$301,625,00. Among these exports were 15,318,097 lbs. of sugar ; 534,937 gallons of molasses, 7,882 gallons of syrup ; 154,257 lbs. of rice, and 263,705 lbs. of coffee. Among the imports were clothing, hats, boots, valued at \$130,796,47 ; crockery and glass ware, \$11,478,45 ; dry goods, \$393,863,53 ; fancy goods, millinery, etc., \$58,224,63 ; iron and steel, \$37,163,69 ; hardware, agricultural implements, tools, etc., \$101,961,74 ; stationery, books, etc., \$24,712, 09. Such a commerce,—the buying of such amounts of such articles for their own consumption, and paying for them by such products of their own labor, by a population of about 70,000, implies the pervasive presence of the arts and industries of civilized life.

We are aware that much of this commerce is managed by naturalized or unnaturalized persons of foreign birth, and some of the sugar and coffee plantations are their property. And we know, too, that others of those plantations are owned and managed by natives ; and that, without the civilization resulting from missionary labors, foreigners could not have done what they have ; nor could merchants, foreign and native, have sold for consumption, that large amount of such foreign goods, as appear on the Custom House Returns. That the



native laborers generally are comfortably and decently clothed, adequately fed, and enjoy the comforts and conveniences of civilized life necessary in that climate, nobody denies.

In the Constitutional Convention of 1864, in reply to a proposal to introduce some English usage, a delegate of German birth said: "He had no wish to be anglicized. The condition of the common people in England was lower than that of our natives." And he quoted a work of Joseph Kay, appointed by the University of Oxford, to investigate the condition of the lower classes, to show their depression, poverty, irreligion, and ignorance. No one of British birth attempted any reply. Attorney General Harris, a native of New Hampshire, to parry the argument, said that "the poor of England were so from over-population, want of land, the full supply of labor wanted, and sharp competition;" but no one attempted to deny the facts.

This remote but natural result of their labors shows that the Mission has been no "failure," but a decided success. And that the American Mission in the Sandwich Islands has been remarkably successful in all its direct objects and reasonably expected results, is well-known in England; among members of the Church of England; among prelates of the Church of England. Of the numerous proofs of this knowledge now on our table, we will use only one. We quote from the *Essex Herald* of October 24, 1865.

On the Thursday previous, "an important and influential meeting" was holden at Chelmsford, in aid of the mission of Bishop Staley. Queen Emma, then on a visit to the Bishop of Rochester, was present. She "entered the assembly room, leaning on the arm of the Bishop of Rochester, who escorted her to a seat by his side on the platform; the whole assembly rising at her entrance, and remaining standing until she had taken her seat." The Bishop presided, and made the opening address. Speaking of the American missionaries, he said:

"He did not know of anything at all in modern times to compare with the fervent, evangelizing spirit shown in this good work. They introduced schools; they formed a lan-

guage, so as to be able to reach and instruct the people's minds; they translated the Bible, and gave themselves in every way they could to the work; and finally, the result of their labors was, that Christianity was in a manner spread over the whole country. The people assembled every Sunday to hear the gospel preached to them; schools were established for the instruction of the young; and family prayer was introduced into the houses of those who had been brought into the faith. Thus they saw that a great work had been done, though the missionaries were of course constantly meeting with difficulties and drawbacks, and fallings-back on old feelings which were not entirely eradicated, such as the belief in witchcraft, which, he was told, was not wholly eradicated from some of our Essex villages." "And all this had been followed by a vast improvement in social order and legislation. They were enabled to introduce a vast number of measures, such as were adopted in civilized and Christian lands, and indeed the state of the country was totally changed, as was evidenced by courtesy and kindness of feeling which pervaded the whole land, as compared with the former state of the people."

After answering several other objections to the Mission, he noticed one on which Bishop Staley delights to dwell. He said:

"Then it was said there was still a great extent of female degeneracy in those Islands. Perhaps this was true; but it was not fair to put it in that way. Let them look at the female degradation in our own large towns. He had served as a clergyman for twelve years in a London parish, and the degradation there of a like kind was of the most lamentable character. He served for a like period at Southampton; and he ventured to say that the state of things described by the writer referred to, who, he supposed, was speaking of the seaport of Honolulu, was not worse than the state of things in Southampton."

These statements, be it remembered, were made in the presence, and as the speaker and the hearers must have believed, with the approbation, of Queen Emma, who was herself a pu-

pil of the American Mission, and could not but know whether they were true. The good Bishop, as is manifest from other parts of his speech, then expected that Bishop Staley's mission would act in courteous and friendly co-operation with the American, and not as its opponent and calumniator.

And now, having shown that the impression which its adversaries have endeavored to make concerning the American Mission, its labors and results, is so directly and so grossly the reverse of truth, must we examine and expose the numerous items of which this false sum total is made up? Must we notice in detail, the assumptions of facts that never happened, the suppression of facts that are notorious, the exaggerations of some facts and understatements of others, the distortions, the misrepresentations, the sophistical inferences and "evil-surmisings," by which the calumniators of the Mission have sought to make their false conclusion appear true, or at least plausible? We decline the needless drudgery. That work has been abundantly done, in numerous publications, periodical and occasional, in the United States, in England, and at the Sandwich Islands. We would refer especially to two of them. One is, the Review of Bishop Staley's Pastoral Address, by Rev. W. D. Alexander, President of Oahu College; published at Honolulu in 1865. The position of the author gave him an accurate knowledge of many facts, not easily accessible to any but a resident at the Islands. The other is a pamphlet of 108 pages, by Rev. William Ellis, once a missionary in the Sandwich Islands, then, for some years, a Secretary of the London Missionary Society; since, well known in connection with Madagascar; and having personal knowledge of the earlier movements which have ended in the establishment of Bishop Staley's mission.

But the question will arise, By what temptations can "the accuser of the Brethren" have beguiled any body into this work of defamation? There have been several temptations; some of which throw such light on the general subject, that it seems worth while to mention them. The first is thus described by Mr. Jarves, in his History of the Hawaiian Islands,

(pp. 113, 114, 115) speaking of the time when the Mission was commenced, "and much later:"

"The native women were but too proud to form connections with white men; the white men were equally free in the gratification of their sensual appetites. The Temperance reformation was then in its infancy. The Pacific was notorious for its facilities for dissipation, and its lack of moral restraint." "The whites settled on the Islands were, with exceptions, it is true, a dissolute race, fostering in the natives the very habits they were too prone to indulge in by nature and by custom, but which the missionary steadily frowned upon as at variance with the morality of the gospel. Under the circumstances, the whites could not but feel reproved by their example, and irritated by their preaching. Hence arose an enmity towards the Mission, confined, at its commencement, to that class whose depraved appetites or selfish interests were affected by the increase of virtue and knowledge." "As that knowledge increased among the people, they inquired the cost of foreign merchandize, and drew comparisons between it and the prices of the traders. The result went naturally to diminish extravagant desires and to lessen the chances of extravagant profits." "At this juncture commenced the struggle between the two parties; the one to uphold morality, strengthen the nation, and implant civilization on the basis of the word of God; the other, with no avowed purpose of opposing these views, but with maintaining an influence favorable to their own less rigid principles, and friendly to their personal desires."

Mr. Dana, as he states in his letter already quoted, found the same class of men there in 1860. He says:

"I sought information from all, foreign and native, friendly and unfriendly; and the conclusion to which I came is, that the best men, those who are best acquainted with the history of things here, hold in high esteem the labors and conduct of the missionaries. The mere seekers of pleasure, power or gain, do not like their influence; and those persons who sympathized with that officer of the American Navy, who com-

pelled the authorities to allow women to go off to his ship by opening his ports and threatening to bombard the town, naturally are hostile to the mission."

These are the men who first invented and circulated nearly all the calumnies which the Bishops of Oxford and Honolulu have adopted and sanctioned. They first described the American missionaries as "severe, sour, and vinegar-like," and charged them with getting the control of the Government, imposing "the iron code of Connecticut," and forbidding innocent amusements. Mr. Jarves and Mr. Dana have correctly described the men, and their motives.

These men, in a few years, found that mere slander was not sufficient to arrest the progress of the gospel and its reforming influences. They needed the aid of a rival mission, less "severe, sour and vinegar-like." For this purpose they (the British Consul, Charlton, taking a leading part in the movement) procured the introduction of the Roman Catholic mission in 1827; and by their help that mission was enabled to maintain itself in the Islands and to make some progress. But gradually two difficulties showed themselves. One was, the dislike of the natives, generally, to Romanism. They disliked it, first, because of the fraud, falsehood, duplicity, and violence with which it had been introduced; and afterwards, because they found—to use their own language—that it consisted in "the worship of images and dead men's bones, and tabus on meat, just like the old religion of the Islands, which they had found to be bad and thrown away." The other difficulty was, that the establishment of a Roman Catholic mission, mostly French, gave the French Government too plausible a pretext for interfering with the affairs of the Islands; a pretext of which that government availed itself to an extent which seemed dangerous to British interests.

To meet these difficulties, another mission was needed, and circumstances favored its formation. The foreign population had increased to nearly 3,000, and that of Honolulu alone to about 1,600. Among them were families preferring the liturgical form of worship used in Protestant Episcopal churches.

The King wished to be a recognized member of some church, but did not exhibit those evidences of personal piety, without which no Puritan church would receive him to its communion. He was persuaded that the liturgical service of the Church of England was what he wanted. There was apparently reason to hope that a church using that service might exert a good influence among those foreign residents who had hitherto stood aloof from every form of religion on the Islands. For these reasons, many thought it desirable that a clergyman of the Church of England, of suitable character, should be induced to settle at Honolulu, that a house of worship should be built for him, and a congregation gathered.

With such views, and no other, apparently, a correspondence was commenced. Rev. Richard Armstrong, D.D., President of the Board of Public Instruction, formerly one of the American missionaries, wrote, Feb. 29, 1860, to the Rev. William Ellis, of London, requesting his co-operation. This was enclosed in a letter from Hon. R. C. Wyllie, Minister of Foreign Affairs, who had already, by the King's order, written to Manley Hopkins, Esq., Hawaiian Consul-General in London. Dr. Armstrong stated that the King took much interest in the subject, and would guarantee \$1,000 of the \$2,000 necessary for the clergyman's salary. He wrote: "I may add, also, that I address you at the request of several Episcopalians, who are among our best people. They want a man of evangelical sentiments, of respectable talents, and most exemplary Christian life." He requested Mr. Ellis to see the Bishop of London on the subject. Mr. Ellis caused these letters to be laid before the Bishop of London, who expressed his approbation of the plan, and his readiness to assist in carrying it out. In all this, there was no request, no appearance of a desire, that an English Bishop and clergy, or an English Mission of any kind, should, be sent to the Islands.\* It, however, furnished an opportunity, which was greedily seized.

---

\* The *London Patriot*, of November 16, 1865, says that "Mr. Wyllie, the Foreign Minister, has repeatedly affirmed that the king did not desire the services of a Bishop."

Somebody in England determined that the Islands should have a Bishop, and a clergy, and everything else that pertains to the Episcopal sect in England. A Committee was appointed, by whom, unless by themselves, and consisting of whom, we know not. A correspondence was commenced, in which we know not what was said ; nor do we expect to know. "Early in the year 1861," Bishop Staley says, the King "wrote an autograph letter to Her Majesty, Queen Victoria. Soon after it had been received, in the month of April, a debate took place in the House of Convocation of Prelates of the Province of Canterbury, on the subject of Missionary Bishops, in the course of which the Bishop of Oxford stated : "That the King of the Sandwich Islands was most anxious to see a Bishop of the English Church established in his dominions." How he learned the fact of the King's anxiety does not appear. The natural implication is, that it was expressed in his letter to the Queen ; but neither Bishop exactly says so.

The publication of that letter, and of the whole correspondence which led to it, has often been called for, but in vain. We are not allowed to know by what means His Hawaiian Majesty was induced to change his mind, and desire "a Bishop of the English Church ;" or how he was induced to change it again, and receive a Bishop, not "of the English Church," but of "the Reformed Catholic Church." We are not allowed to know how far he actually assented to the withholding of what he asked for and the giving of something else ; or how far he knew what was to be sent him, till it actually came and showed itself. One thing, however, much to his Majesty's credit, we do know, on the authority of the Bishop of Oxford, as reported by the Bishop of Honolulu. "His Majesty mentioned," apparently in that letter, "that according to the Constitution of his kingdom, no established church in the proper sense of the term can be formed there ; that all creeds are left free, to be supported by voluntary contributions." The letters which he received from England, then, contained something, to which he deemed this an appropriate reply.

The substantial correctness of our statement is proved by



the highest ecclesiastical authority in England. The Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Dr. Anderson, September 28, 1860: "I find it to be quite true, that certain individuals have formed themselves into a committee, for the purpose of *taking advantage* of the proposal of the King of Hawaii, and with the *ultimate view* of establishing a Bishop on the Polynesian Islands." "It is altogether untrue, that the archbishop encourages the plan, of which, in fact, he was ignorant until your letter arrived."\* Dr. Anderson's letter was dated September 3d.

Notice, that in September, 1860, the plan was that of a few "individuals" in England. It was, not to comply with the request, but to "take advantage of the proposal," of the king; and the purpose of sending out a Bishop was then not immediate, but only "ultimate." The plan was unknown to the archbishop, "Primate of all England," till he learned it by a letter from Boston; and it did not receive his approbation. There had yet been no request of the king for a Bishop.

The self-constituted committee, however, persevered in their work; induced the king to write something which they called a request; induced the Bishop of London to abstain from further opposition; obtained a license from the Queen, through Earl Russell, December 11, 1861, expressing Her Majesty's "royal will and pleasure," that the archbishop of Canterbury should "consecrate the Rev. Thomas Nettleship Staley, Clerk, Master of Arts, a British subject, to be bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands, and all other of the dominions of the king of Hawaii;" and on the 15th of December, he was consecrated accordingly.

As we have said, we do not expect that the whole correspondence, leading to this result, will ever be made public. Those in whose custody it is, doubtless know that the suspicions which are abroad concerning its honesty, are less injurious to them than the complete knowledge of all the facts

---

\* The story in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, that the king sent such a request to the Queen and the archbishop in 1859, must, therefore, be a mistake.

would be ; and therefore, notwithstanding all the calls for its publication, they keep it close.

We have intimated that political and commercial motives have had something to do with this movement. This has been often alleged, and indignantly denied by Bishop Staley and others. We are willing to accept their denial, so far as concerns themselves. Perhaps they are, in this respect, the mere unconscious tools of political and commercial schemers. Still, the intimation is true. We quote, first, from the London *Evening Standard*, of November 14, 1861.

"Ever since the accession of the present emperor of the French to his present position, he has cast longing eyes upon these important Islands. By every art of flattery, by costly presents, by threats and intimidation, it has been his endeavor to diminish the influence of Great Britain in these Islands. At the very moment the king of Hawaii learns the refusal of this country to allow of a bishop being sent to him, he will receive another valuable proof of the emperor's solicitude and attention. Concurrently with this, he is pressed to make the Roman church the established faith of these Islands, and every inducement is being held out to make this the religion of his own court. As English churchmen, we view, therefore, this interference of the Bishop of London with the greatest apprehension ; but as English citizens, we confess to some feeling of alarm at the prospect that, a few years hence, the splendid harbor of Honolulu may become a French possession ; that in the event of any war with France, the most valuable port in the North Pacific will be held by the enemies of this country. These are not merely imaginary or even remote possibilities, but a too probable result of the unwise and unaccountable refusal of the officers of the Crown to sanction the consecration of a bishop to these Islands."

This, it will be seen, was before the license for Bishop Staley's consecration, and before the Bishop of London had ceased his active opposition to it.

We next quote from the London *Saturday Review*, of September 9, 1865.

"It is very well to know that Providence has planted the Sandwich Islands just at the midway of that magnificent commerce which steam and modern enterprize have created in the wide Pacific, with the most commodious harbors, and a soil capable of producing a great abundance of the materials of subsistence. It is something more to realize the fact, that these Sandwich Islands, governed by a native dynasty, which has always shown itself peculiarly friendly to England, are one thing, and that the Sandwich Islands, gobbled up by omniverous Yankeedom, or by any other power, would be quite another thing." "Her task is, but to let England appreciate the fact, that there is one indigenous state, of civilized standing and of great commercial advantage to British commerce, which really does love the Union Jack better than the Stars and Stripes."

And lastly, we quote from a speech of the Bishop of Oxford, reported in the *Leeds Mercury*:

"And remember, there are peculiar reasons in the very position of these islands why we should make these efforts on their behalf. There are, *first of all, political and national reasons*. It is of the utmost moment to us that that friendliness which now exists in this people to us should be continued. They lie upon the very direct track of our ships from our new and growing colony of British Columbia especially, and there is no calculating the injury which might be done to English commerce if these islands were alienated from us, and in any future disturbed state of the world were possessed by enemies of this country; so that it is your interest, even as regards the things of this world, to found a branch of your church there, and, by that which is the most abiding and binding tie, to attach them in affection to yourselves."

In the presence of these proofs, the most impudent mendacity cannot deny that political and commercial motives have had something to do with the establishment of this bishopric.

Bishop Staley arrived at Honolulu, October 11, 1862, accompanied by two presbyters, and was followed by a third. They were cordially received by the king and queen. They

were also cordially received, so far as they allowed themselves to be, by the Puritan clergy. Within a month, one of them was invited to meet with some of them and some laymen for prayer. He consulted his Bishop, and declined, lest he should thereby "encourage people to suppose he did not consider Episcopal ordination as necessary for a Christian minister." They all took effectual care never to encourage any such supposition. It was important, for the accomplishment of their object, that they should do so. Bishop Staley then evidently felt, as he says in his Pastoral Address of 1865, (page 13) "that the church of which we are members, has something more to proclaim than was understood by the first evangelizers of these Islands. If not, I fully admit, we have no business here." To justify their presence, therefore, they must make that "something" very manifest.

And what is that "something?" It is not the Bible, translated into the language of the people. This, he acknowledges, that the "first evangelizers" have given. It is not "the great facts of the life, suffering and death of the Redeemer, the necessity of God's Holy Spirit to renew man's sinful nature." These, he acknowledges, they have taught. It is this: (pp. 14, and 16.)

"Theirs is the denominational, ours the Catholic view of Christianity. I do not use the word Catholic in the sense in which it is often used, as implying that all sects stand on the same footing, so far as their claims to teach God's truth are concerned—this is a perversion of the term—nor as synonymous with Roman. It is true, Rome arrogates to herself that title; we deny her not to be a branch of the church, though she has in many points sadly erred from the Catholic faith and the Catholic practice. I use the term as it was used in the first three centuries, (the purest age of the church) as applying to the one visible historic body, which has descended in unbroken continuity from the days of the apostles to our own. We believe that whatever good other societies of Christians have done, who have left that ancient apostolical organization, I mean the Episcopal, be they Meletians, Do-

natists, Independents, Methodists, etc., and we judge them not—God forbid—yet it is through that one visible body, the Catholic church, we can alone taste the fullness of God's love, and assure to ourselves the presence of Him who hath promised to be with it to the end of the world." . . . "Now, the continuity of this Holy Catholic church, depends on the ordaining power of Bishops."

There it is. That is the "something," in addition to redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and the Bible in the language of the people, to teach these precious truths, which the Bishop must bring, or he has "no business" in the Islands.

But who is this, that, in such "great swelling words of vanity," undertakes to represent the "Holy Catholic church" of all lands and all ages, and denies the "claims" of "all sects" but his own, "to teach God's truth?" He is the representative of the youngest, and as is generally understood, the smallest of the three principal subdivisions of one of the many sects that are to be found inhabiting the south end of an island on the coast of Europe; a sect which neither the Church of Rome, nor the Greek Church, nor even the Jacobites of Mesopotamia, though sedulously courted and humbly besought, will consent to recognize as anything but heretics and schismatics; a sect, too, containing a great multitude of excellent men and ministers of the gospel, who neither approve his plans nor believe his "something;" and in whose judgment, therefore, he has "no business" where he is.

But what is his "something" good for? And is it needed at the Islands? If not, he may as well go home and labor at Southampton, which, according to the Bishop of Rochester, is as vicious, in one respect at least, as Honolulu; or at Liverpool, which has a still worse reputation; or in London, where there is many times more vice of every sort, than the whole population of the Islands could commit, if they should all the time "do evil with both hands earnestly." He says that, after all that has been done at the Islands, something more needs to be done; just as if that were not true of every place on earth,

and every place that will be on earth, so long as Adam's posterity continue to be born in his image. He must show more than this. He must show that the Puritan Mission has been "a failure." He must show that it has not done what we have shown that it has done, and what the Bishop of Rochester, in the presence of Queen Emma, testified that it had done. For this purpose, he and his partisans must collect and endorse, and send forth all the stale and oft-refuted slanders of the men described by Mr. Jarves and Mr. Dana; must strain their eyes to discover some other evil thing to say of the Puritan missionaries; and must fill out the picture with their own "evil surmisings."

Such have been the leading motives for the recent calumnies against the American Mission in the Sandwich Islands; and with this exposure, we leave the calumniators to their own reflection.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE ATHANASIAN CREED.\*

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.

WE propose in this essay to discuss the name, origin, authority, contents, value, and use of the so-called Athanasian Symbol, which, next to the Apostles' Creed, and the Nicene Creed, is the most generally received Confession of Faith in the Christian church, and presents to us a succinct and clear summary of ancient Catholic theology concerning the fundamental articles of the Holy Trinity and the Person of Christ.

---

\* The necessary general information on this subject may be found in Tillemont: *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*. (tom. VIII, 677 sqq.); Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (vol. IV, 118 sqq.); J. G. Walch: *Introductio in libros ecclesiæ Luth. symbolicos* (lib. I, cap. 2 de tribus symbolis œcumenicis, p. 36 sqq.); and Koellner: *Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen*, Theil I. p. 53 sqq. Besides there are a number of special dissertations on the Athanasian Creed, the best of which are the following: G. J. Voss (a Dutch Reformed divine): *De tribus symbolis*, Amsterd. 1642; Archbishop Usher (Anglican): *De symbolis*, Lond. 1647; J. H. Heidegger (Swiss Reformed): *De symbolo Athana-*

For the convenience of the reader, we give first the symbol itself in three parallel columns, in the original Latin, the old English translation of the sixteenth century, as found in the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England, and a revised translation. We italicize those words which we have changed in the revision for reasons of taste, clearness, and closer adherence to the original.

*The Latin Original.*      *Old Translation.*      *Revised Translation.*

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 1. Quicumque vult sal-<br>vus esse, ante omnia<br>opus est, ut teneat ca-<br>tholicam fidem ;                    | 1. Whosoever will be<br>saved : before all things<br>it is necessary that he<br>hold the Catholick Faith ;  | 1. Whosoever will be<br>saved, before all things<br>it is necessary that he<br>hold the Catholic faith ;   |
| 2. Quam nisi quisque<br>integram inviolatamque<br>servaverit, absque du-<br>bio in æternum peribit.              | 2. Which Faith ex-<br>cept every one do keep<br>whole and undefiled :<br>without doubt he shall<br>perish everlastingly.  | 2. Which faith ex-<br>cept every one do keep<br>whole and undefiled,<br>without doubt he shall<br>perish everlastingly.                                  |
| 3. Fides autem ca-<br>tholica hæc est, ut un-<br>um Deum in trinitate et<br>trinitatem in unitate<br>veneremur ; | 3. And the Catholick<br>Faith is this : That we<br>worship one God in<br>Trinity, and Trinity in<br>Unity.  | 3. And the Catholic<br>faith is this : that we<br>worship one God in<br>Trinity, and Trinity in<br>Unity.  |
| 4. Neque confunden-<br>tes personas, neque sub-<br>stantiam separantes.  | 4. Neither confound-<br>ing the Persons : nor<br>dividing the substance.  | 4. Neither confound-<br>ing the persons, nor di-<br>viding the substance.  |
| 5. Alia est enim per-<br>sona patris : alia filii :<br>alia spiritus sancti.                                     | 5. For there is one<br>Person of the Father, another<br>of the Son, and another<br>of the Holy Ghost.   | 5. For there is one<br>person of the Father, another<br>of the Son, and another<br>of the Holy Ghost.  |
| 6. Sed patris et filii<br>et spiritus sancti una<br>est divinitas : æqualis<br>gloria, coæterna majes-<br>tas.   | 6. But the Godhead of<br>the Father, of the Son, of<br>the Holy Ghost, Son, and<br>of the Holy Ghost, is all<br>one : the Glory equal,<br>the Majesty co-eternal. | 6. But the Godhead<br>of the Father, of the<br>Father, of the Son, and<br>of the Holy Ghost, is all<br>one ; the glory equal,<br>the majesty co-eternal. |

siano, Zur. 1680 ; E. Tenzel (Lutheran) : *Iudicia eruditorum de Symb. Athanas.* studiosè collecta, Gothæ. 1697 ; Montfaucon (Rom. Catholic) : *Diatribe in Symbolum Quicumque*, in the Bened. edition of the works of St. Athanasius, Par. 1698, tom. II, 719-735 ; Dan. Waterland (Anglican) : *A critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, representing the opinions of the Ancients and Moderns concerning it : with an account of the Mss. Verss. and Comments and such other particulars as are of moment for the determining of the Age, and Author, and Value of it, and the Time of its Reception in the Christian churches, Cambridge, 1724 ; 2d ed. 1728, also in Dr. Waterland's Works, ed. by Dr. Mildert, in 6 vols. Oxf. 1843, vol. III, p. 97-270. This is still the most thorough essay on the Athanasian Creed. Also Speroni (Roman Catholic) : *De symbolo vulgo S. Athanasii*, Patav. 1751 ; Harvey (Anglican) : *The History and Theology of the Three Creeds*, Lond. 1856, vol. II, p. 541-695.



*The Latin Original.**Old Translation.**Revised Translation.*

7. Qualis pater, talis filius, talis spiritus sanctus. 7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. 7. Such as is the Father, such also is the Son, and such the Holy Ghost.
8. Increatus pater : increatus filius : increatus spiritus sanctus. 8. The Father *uncreated*, the Son *uncreated* : ated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Ghost *uncreated*. 8. The Father uncreated, and the Holy Ghost uncreated.
9. Immensus pater : immensus filius : immensus spiritus sanctus. 9. The Father *incomprehensible*, the Son *incomprehensible* : and the Holy Ghost *incomprehensible*.\* 9. The Father unlimited, the Son unlimited, and the Holy Ghost unlimited.
10. Aeternus pater : aeternus filius : aeternus spiritus sanctus. 10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal : and the Holy Ghost eternal. 10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal.
11. Et tamen non tres aeterni ; sed unus aeternus. 11. And yet *they are* not three aeternals : but one eternal. 11. And yet not three aeternals, but one eternal.
12. Sicut non tres creati : nec tres immensi : sed unus increatus et unus immensus. 12. As also there are not three *incomprehensibles*, nor three uncreated : but one uncreated, and one *incomprehensible*. 12. As also, not three uncreated, nor three unlimited ; but one uncreated, and one unlimited.
13. Similiter omnipotens pater : omnipotens filius : omnipotens spiritus sanctus. 13. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty : and the Holy Ghost Almighty. 13. So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Ghost almighty.
14. Et tamen non tres omnipotentes ; sed unus omnipotens. 14. And yet *they are* not three Almighties, but one Almighty. 14. And yet not three almighties, but one almighty.
15. Ita deus pater : deus filius : deus spiritus sanctus. 15. So the Father is God, the Son is God : and the Holy Ghost is God. 15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.
16. Et tamen non tres dii ; sed unus est Deus. 16. And yet *they are* not three Gods, but one God. 16. And yet not three Gods, but one God.
17. Ita dominus pater : dominus filius : dominus spiritus sanctus. 17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord : and the Holy Ghost Lord. 17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord.
18. Et tamen non tres domini : sed unus Dominus. 18. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord. 18. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord.
19. Quia sicut singulus. 19. For like as we 19. For like as we

\* *Incomprehensible* is a false translation, unless it be taken in the unusual sense, not to be comprehended within any bounds. The Anglican translator of 1548 perhaps followed a Greek copy, which renders *immensus* by ἀκατάλητος. But other Greek copies read ἀπειρος or ἀμετρος instead. The Latin *immensus* means what cannot be circumscribed or limited by any boundaries, what is illocal, omnipresent.

*Original Latin.**Old Translation.**Revised Translation.*

latim uamquamque are compelled by the are compelled by the  
personam Deum ac Dom- Christian verity : to ac- Christian verity, to ac-  
inum confiteri, christia- knowledge every Person knowledge each person,  
na veritate compelli- by himself to be God by himself to be God  
mur : and Lord. and Lord ;

20. Ita tres deos, aut 20. So are we forbid- 20. So are we forbid-  
tres dominos dicere, den by the Catholick den by the Catholic re-  
catholica religione pro- Religion : to say, There ligion to say : There are  
hibemur. be three Gods, or three three Gods or three  
Lords. Lords.

21. Pater a nullo est 21. The Father is 21. The Father is made  
factus, nec creatus ; nec made of none : neither of none, neither created  
genitus. created, nor begotten. nor begotten.

22. Filius a patre solo 22. The Son is of the 22. The Son is of the  
est : non factus ; nec Father alone ; not made, Father alone, not made,  
creatus ; sed genitus. nor created, but begot- nor created, but begot-  
ten. ten.

23. Spiritus sanctus 23. The Holy Ghost 23. The Holy Ghost  
a patre et filio : non fac- is of the Father and of is of the Father and of  
tus ; nec creatus ; nec the Son ; neither made, the Son, neither made,  
genitus, sed procedens. nor created, nor begot- nor created, nor begot-  
ten, but proceeding. ten, but proceeding.

24. Unus ergo pater ; 24. So there is one 24. So there is one  
non tres patres : unus Father, not three Fa- Father, not three Fa-  
filius, non tres filii : un- thers ; one Son, not thers ; one Son, not  
us spiritus sanctus, non three Sons ; one Holy three Sons ; one Holy  
tres spiritus sancti. Ghost, not three Holy Ghost, not three Holy  
Ghosts. Ghosts.

25. Et in hac trinitate 25. And in this Trin- 25. And in this Trin-  
nihil prius ; aut poste- ity none is afore, or after ity there is no before,  
rius : nihil majus ; aut other : none is greater, nor after ; no greater  
minus. or less than another ; nor less.

26. Sed totae tres 26. But the whole 26. But the whole  
personae coaeternae si- three Persons are co- three persons are co-  
bi sunt et coequalles. eternal together ; and co- eternal, and co-equal.  
equal.

27. Ita, ut per omnia, 27. So that in all 27. So that in all  
sicut jam supra dictum things, as aforesaid : the things, as aforesaid :  
est, et trinitas in uni- Unity in Trinity, and the Unity in Trinity, and  
tate : et unitas in trini- the Trinity in Unity, is the Trinity in Unity is  
tate venerenda sit. to be worshipped. to be worshipped.

28. Qui vult ergo sal- 28. He therefore that 28. He therefore that  
vus esse, ita de trini- will be saved: must thus will be saved, must thus  
tate sentiat. think of the Trinity. think of the Trinity.

29. Sed necessarium 29. Furthermore it is 29. Furthermore, it is  
est ad aeternam salu- necessary to everlasting necessary to everlasting  
tem, ut incarnationem salvation : that he also salvation, that we also  
tem, ut incarnationem believe rightly the In- believe truly the Incar-  
Jesu Christi fidelitur nation of our Lord nation of our Lord Jesus  
credat. Jesus Christ. Christ.

30. Est ergo fides rec- 30. For the right 30. For the right  
ta, ut credamus et con- Faith is, that we believe faith is, that we believe

## Original Latin.

## Old Translation.

## Revised Translation.

fiteamur, quod dominus and confess: that our and confess, that our  
 noster Jesus Christus Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord Jesus Christ, the  
 Dei filius, deus et homo Son of God, is God and Son of God, is God and  
 Man; man.

31. Deus ex substan- 31. God, of the Sub- 31. God, of the sub-  
 tia patris, ante secula stance of the Father, stance of the Father,  
 genitus, et homo ex sub- begotten before the begotten before the  
 stantia matris, in seculo worlds: and Man, of worlds; and man, of  
 natus. the Substance of his the substance of his  
 Mother, born in the mother, born in the  
 world. world.

32. Perfectus deus: 32. Perfect God and 32. Perfect God, and  
 perfectus homo, ex ani- perfect Man; of a rea- perfect man, of a rea-  
 ma rationali et humana sonable soul and human sonable soul and human  
 carne subsistens. flesh subsisting; flesh subsisting;

33. Aequalis patri se- 33. Equal to the Fa- 33. Equal to the Fa-  
 cundum divinitatem: ther, *as touching* his ther, according to His  
 minor patri secundum Godhead; and inferior Godhead, and inferior  
 humanitatem. to the Father *as touching* to the Father, according  
 his Manhood. to His manhood.

34. Qui licet Deus sit 34. Who although he 34. Who although he  
 et homo; non duo tam- be God and Man; yet he be God and man, yet he  
 en, sed unus est Chris- is not, two, but one is not two, but one  
 tus. Christ; Christ;

35. Unus autem, non 35. One; not by con- 35. One, not by con-  
 conversione divinitatis version of the Godhead version of the Godhead  
 in carnem; sed assump- into flesh; but by *tak*- into flesh, but by as-  
 tionem humanitatis in De- ing of the Manhood in- sumption of the man-  
 um. to God; hood into God;

36. Unus omnino, non 36. One altogether; 36. One altogether,  
 confusione substantiae; not by confusion of Sub- not by confusion of sub-  
 sed unitate personae. stance: but by unity of stance, but by anity of  
 Person. person.

37. Nam sicut anima 37. For as the reason- 37. For as the reason-  
 rationalis et caro unus able soul and flesh is able soul and flesh is  
 est homo; ita deus et one man: so God and one man; so God and  
 homo unus est Christus. Man is one Christ; man is one Christ.

38. Qui passus est 38. Who suffered for 38. Who suffered for  
 pro nostra salute: de- our salvation: descend- our salvation, descend-  
 scendit ad inferos: ter- ed into *hell*: rose again ed into *hades*, rose  
 tia die resurrexit a mor- the third day from the again the third day from  
 tuis. dead. the dead.

39. Ascendit ad coel- 39. He ascended into 39. He ascended into  
 os: sedet ad dexteram heaven, He sitteth on heaven, He sitteth at the  
 dei patris omnipotentis. the right hand of the right hand of God the  
 Father God Almighty. Father Almighty.

40. Inde venturus est 40. From whence He 40. From thence He  
 judicare vivos et mor- shall come to judge the shall come to judge the  
 tuos. quick and the dead. quick and the dead.

41. Ad cuius adven- 41. At whose coming 41. At whose coming  
 tum omnes homines re- all men *shall* rise again all men must rise again  
 surgere habent cum cor- with their bodies, with their bodies;  
 poribus suis;

<i>Original Latin.</i>	<i>Old Translation.</i>	<i>Revised Translation.</i>
42. Et redditori sunt de factis propriis rationem.	42. And shall give account for their own works.	42. And shall give account for their own works.
43. Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam eternam; qui vero mala, in ignem eternum.	43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire.	43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire.
44. Haec est fides catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.	44. This is the Catholik Faith: which except a man believe <i>faithfully</i> , he cannot be saved.	44. This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe truly and firmly, he cannot be saved.

## NAME.

The third ecumenical or universal Creed of the Christian church bears a double name.

It is sometimes called the *Symbolum Quicumque* or simply the *Quicumque*\* from its beginning in Latin: *Quicumque vult salvus esse*, Whosoever will be saved.

But more generally it goes by the name of the *Athanasian Creed*,† from the supposed authorship of St. Athanasius, or its agreement with his theology. This makes it necessary to say a few words on this distinguished father.

Athanasius was the leading champion of the orthodox doctrine on the divinity of Christ, and the Holy Trinity in the Nicene age. He was born towards the close of the third century, at Alexandria, the capital of Egypt. His youth fell in that remarkable transition period of the Christian church from oppression and persecution to victory and power in the Roman Empire. He made his first appearance on the stage of history at the first general Council, convened by Constantine the Great at the city of Nice in 325, for the purpose of settling the Arian controversy, i. e., the question, whether Christ be strictly divine or not; whether he be the eternal Son of the Father and

\* First used by Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, about A. D. 852, who calls it also "Sermonem Athanasii de fide, cuius initium est: *Quicumque vult salvus esse*."

† It first bears this name in the oldest complete manuscript copy extant, called "Cod. Usserianus secundus," ascribed to the year 703. It has the title: "*Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini*."

equal in substance or essence with him (*ὁμοούσιος*), or whether he be a creature of God, though made before the world, and consequently of a different substance (*ἑτεροούσιος*). Although at that time merely an archdeacon and secretary of the bishop Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius occupied by his talents and zeal the most prominent place in that Council among the defenders of the strict divinity of our Saviour against the Arians who denied it, and materially aided the triumph of the orthodox view, as embodied and symbolically fixed in what has since been called the Nicene Creed. Soon afterwards he became the successor of Alexander in the first episcopal see of Egypt. From this time on, during the long continued Arian and Semi-Arian conflicts which soon followed the temporary settlement at the Nicene synod, he stood forth as the acknowledged leader of the Nicene or orthodox party, beloved by his friends, feared by his enemies, admired and respected by all. He devoted his whole life, with unwavering consistency in prosperity and adversity, at home and in exile, to the defence of the true Godhead of Christ. This was the one great idea of his mind, the ruling passion of his heart, the all-absorbing object of his will. For this he suffered five times deposition and exile. For this he was willing at any time to shed his blood. He was a man of one idea, indeed, but an idea which he firmly and justly believed to be absolutely fundamental to the Christian system and the salvation of the world. To the violence and intrigues of the imperial court, to the passions and fanaticism of heretical parties, he uniformly opposed the overwhelming force of a commanding genius and a holy life. One Athanasius against the whole world! Although he died several years before the final settlement of this great controversy by the second oecumenical council, held at Constantinople in 381, the triumph of the orthodox view must, under God, be mainly attributed to him.

Anathasius was unquestionably the greatest man of his age, and one of the purest and noblest in the history of the church. He is justly called the Great, and the Father of Orthodoxy.

Even Gibbon, with all his strong prejudices against the

faith of Athanasius and the Christian religion, has pronounced an eloquent eulogy on him in the XXI chapter of his celebrated work. "We have seldom," says this deistic historian, "an opportunity of observing, either in active or speculative life, what effect may be produced, or what obstacles may be surmounted, by the force of a single mind when it is inflexibly applied to the pursuit of a single object. The immortal name of Athanasius will never be separated from the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defence he consecrated every moment and every faculty of his being. Educated in the family of Alexander, he had vigorously opposed the early progress of the Arian heresy : he exercised the important functions of secretary under the aged prelate ; and the fathers of the Nicene council beheld with surprise and respect the rising virtues of the young deacon. In a time of public danger, the dull claims of age and rank are sometimes superseded ; and within five months after his return from Nice, the deacon Athanasius was seated on the archepiscopal throne of Egypt. He filled that eminent station above forty-six years ; and his long administration was spent in a perpetual combat against the powers of Arianism. Five times was Athanasius expelled from his throne ; twenty years he passed as an exile or a fugitive ; and almost every province of the Roman Empire was successively witness to his merits and his sufferings in the cause of the Homousion, which he considered as the sole pleasure and business, as the duty and as the glory of his life. Amidst the storms of persecution, the archbishop of Alexandria was patient of labor, jealous of fame, careless of safety ; and although his mind was tainted by the contagion of fanaticism, Athanasius displayed a superiority of character and abilities which would have qualified him far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine for the government of a great monarchy. . . . The archbishop of Alexandria was capable of distinguishing how far he might boldly command, and where he must dexterously insinuate ; how long he might contend with power, and when he must withdraw from persecution ; and while he directed the thunders of the church against

heresy, he could assume, in the bosom of his own party, the flexible and indulgent temper of a prudent leader. The election of Athanasius has not escaped the reproach of irregularity and precipitation; but the propriety of his behavior conciliated the affections both of the clergy and of the people. The Alexandrians were impatient to rise in arms for the defence of an eloquent and liberal pastor. In his distress he always derived support, or at least consolation, from the faithful attachment of his parochial clergy; and the hundred bishops of Egypt adhered, with unshaken zeal, to the cause of Athanasius. In the modest equipage which pride and policy would affect, he frequently performed the episcopal visitation of his provinces, from the mouth of the Nile to the confines of Aethiopia; familiarly conversing with the meanest of the populace, and humbly saluting the saints and hermits of the desert. Nor was it only in ecclesiastical assemblies, among men whose education and manners were similar to his own, that Athanasius displayed the ascendancy of his genius. He appeared with easy and respectful firmness in the courts of princes; and in the various turns of his prosperous and adverse fortune he never lost the confidence of his friends or the esteem of his enemies."

#### ORIGIN.

But is Athanasius really the author of the creed which has so long been identified with his distinguished name? This question must be decided in the negative, as much so as the question of the strictly apostolic origin of the first ecumenical creed. And yet in both cases there is a certain propriety in the name, if we leave out of view the form of words and actual composition, and look merely to the contents and their essential agreement with the faith and teaching of the supposed authors.

It is probable that the designation which cannot be traced beyond the eighth century, was first given to this document with the view simply to characterize its doctrinal tone, as the



expression of the faith of Athanasius,\* (hence the oldest titles: *fides Athanasii*," *fides Catholica*"), and not to indicate the, literal authorship for the purpose of clothing it at once with the authority of a great and universally revered name. At all events there is no room here for a wilful, pious fraud. An innocent mistake explains the matter sufficiently, especially in an uncritical age. The real author of this trinitarian creed being unknown, it was naturally traced, first by way of mere conjecture and supposition, to the great representative of the received doctrine of the Holy Trinity, whose very name was identified with orthodoxy as regards this particular article. For the terms Athanasian, homoousian, Nicene, orthodox, are used synonymously in the history of the Arian and Semi-Arian controversies of the Nicene Age. This conjecture was, however, by no means generally received at first. Several manuscript copies of the Creed give either no name at all,† or ascribe it to a different author, Anastasius.‡ We find doubts yet as late as the twelfth century.§ But after this time the belief in the Athanasian origin became general, and prevailed, without examination, down towards the middle of the seventeenth century,|| when Gerhard John Vossius, a Dutch Reformed divine, first made it the subject of a critical dissertation in 1642, and turned the current. Since that time it is universally given up by historians and critics, not only by Protestants, as Vossius, Heidegger, Usher, Jeremy Taylor, Pearson, Cave, Bingham, Cudworth, Fabricius, Waterland, Buddeus, Walch,

\* This was the view of Weber, *Lib. symb.* p. 17: "Ab Athanasio nomen habet, non quod ab illo viro vere scriptum sit, sed quod cum sententia Athanasii maxime conveniat." See Kœllner, l. c., p. 55.

† Codd. Uss. 1, Treves, Ambrosian., Colb. 1, Regius, Benet C. 2, Benet C. 3. Cotton 3, Cambridge, St. Jam. 2. Comp. Waterland, p. 24, and Kollner, p. 72.

‡ So the German MSS. Waterland, however, supposes that this is a mere orthographical mistake for Arthanasius.

§ In 1138 by Otho in the words: "Athanasius a quibusdam dicitur edidisse;" and in 1190 by Belet in the words: "Quod ab Athan. P. A. compositum est: plerique cum Anastasium fuisse falso arbitrantur." See Montfaucon, *Diatr.* etc., in *Opp. Athan.* II, 722.

|| The last distinguished defendants were the Roman Catholic divines, Baronius (*Annal.* ad ann. 340 num. 11), Bona (*De divina Psalmodia* 1663, who rests his faith on Baronius), and Bellarminus.

Schroeckh, Neander, Gieseler, Köllner, but also by Roman Catholics, as Petavius (1644), Quesnel (1675), Natalis Alexander (1676), Dupin (1687), Pagi (1688), Tillemont (1695), Montfaucon (1698), Muratori (1698), Speroni, (1751), and even pope Benedict XIV.

The arguments against the authorship of Athanasius are so strong indeed that it is impossible to resist them. Köllner enumerates nineteen. We will mention only the principal ones.

1. Athanasius himself never mentions this symbol in any of his works, and had no occasion to compose it, being satisfied with the Nicene Creed, and bent upon explaining and maintaining it against every opposition. Yea, he says distinctly, in one passage,\* that the Nicene Creed was sufficient, and that no other profession of faith should be issued.

2. It is not found in any of the older manuscripts of the works of Athanasius, and those which have it, either deny it to him, or express a doubt as to his authorship.†

3. It is not mentioned by any cotemporary of Athanasius, nor his biographers and eulogists,‡ nor by any of the fathers and councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, although during the all-absorbing trinitarian and christological controversies, they had frequent occasion to allude to this important document if it existed, and although they frequently appeal to the authority of Athanasius and mention his other writings. Under these circumstances, the silence is absolutely conclusive against

\* Ep. ad Antioch. tom. I. p. 772. Comp. Köllner, p. 73, and Walch, l. c. p. 149.

† Scultetus, in *Medulla Patrum*, part 2, de Athan. c. 40, says: "In nullo codice extat quos ego quidem vidi, inter Athanasii opera. In uno legitur; sed auctoris nomine suppresso." Speroni, l. c. (quoted by Köllner, p. 72) says more distinctly: "At multi codd. Mss. sunt, qui non modo non habent hoc symbolum, quamquam opera omnia comprehendant Athanasii; sed negant omnino his verbis: *Symbolum vulgo Athanasii, Symbolum quod non est Athanasii, Symbolum perperam Athanasio tributum.*"

‡ The only allusion which former writers have been able to find, is a passage of Gregorius Nazianz., in his laudatory oration on Athanasius, where he speaks of him as having confessed (*ὁμολογῆσας*) the Godhead and essence of the three Persons *τὴν τριῶν θεότηα καὶ οὐσίαν*. But it is now universally conceded that this does not refer to a particular creed at all, or if so, to one of the two other confessions still extant, in which he likewise speaks of the Godhead and essence of the three Persons.

the very existence of the Athanasian Creed at the time, unless we choose to suppose that it was concealed for nearly three hundred years, and then suddenly turned up in the sixth or seventh century, which would imply an almost miraculous preservation.

4. The symbol under consideration was evidently first written in the Latin language, and seems to have been unknown among the Greeks before the eleventh century. There are but few Greek manuscript copies extant,\* and they differ so much that they unmistakably point to several and rather unskilled translators. Now, it is very improbable that Athanasius, even if he knew Latin sufficiently to write so well, should have composed such an important document in a foreign tongue, instead of his own vernacular Greek, which was then the prevailing language of the church, and used even by the early Western fathers, as Clement of Rome, Irenaeus of Gaul, and Hippolytus of Rome. The report, that Athanasius composed it during his exile at Treves, about 340, and submitted it to pope Julius of Rome, in proof of his orthodoxy against the charge of heresy, or that he wrote it at Rome, and that it remained concealed there for a long time, is utterly worthless, since it is not even mentioned before the twelfth century (1130), and is evidently one of the many falsehoods which were manufactured in the middle age for the supposed benefit of the absolute papacy. No Roman divine of any weight, since Baronius and Bellarmin, has dared to give it credit.

5. To these external arguments, though mostly of a negative and indirect character, must be added the internal evidence of the Creed itself, which alone is conclusive. For while it omits the favorite expressions of Athanasius, especially the term *homoousios*, on which the whole Arian controversy turned, it contains the later Latin addition *et filio*, concerning the pro-

---

\* Four according to Montfaucon, eight according to Waterland. The former asserts that none of them was written before 1300. "Nullum vidimus Graecum huius symboli codicem, qui trecentorum sit annorum; nec antiquum alium a quoquam visum fuisse novimus." *Diatrise de Symb.* Quicunque in *Opp. Athan.* II, p. 727.

cession of the Holy Ghost,\* which the Greek Church never admitted, and generally goes beyond the Athanasian theology and the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, not only in the Trinity, but still more in the Christology. We fully admit that he had already substantially the same faith, but by no means the same logical consciousness or scientific comprehension of it, as is here implied.† He nowhere in his writings speaks so clearly and definitely of the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, and as to the two natures of Christ, he even uses expressions which in a *later* age would have been justly liable to a Monophysite or Eutychian construction,‡ while the Creed which bears his name, is as clear and distinct on this subject as the council of Chalcedon.

But the more difficult question now arises, who is the real author of this remarkable production? Here is a wide field for critical conjecture. Quite a number of persons have been proposed with more or less plausibility, but without sufficient evidence in any case, viz.: Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus in Africa, about 484;§ Vincentius Lirinensis, about

\* V. 23: Spiritus Sanctus a Patre *et Filio*, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens.

† This is honestly admitted even by his learned Benedictine editor, Montfauc. l. c. p. 723: "Licet enim una eademque semper fuerit ea de re Ecclesiae doctrina, nondum tamen hae formulae in ecclesia receptae vel in confesso erant." He asserts an entire difference of style between the Symbolum Quicunque and the genuine Athanasian writings.

‡ Especially in one passage De incarnatione Verbi (Opp. ed Montfauc. tom. III. p. 1), where he says: "We profess also that there is one Son of God who is God according to the Spirit, and Son of man according to the flesh; not two natures, the one to be worshipped, the other not, but one nature of the God Logos which became incarnate (*ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένην*) and is to be worshipped together with his flesh in one worship." This, and similar passages of Hilary, and even Pope Julius I, have given great trouble to such Roman divines who deny all development and change in the doctrine of their Church. Comp. Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte I, 2, § 88. p. 133 seq. We should not forget, however, that Athanasius, and even the original Nicene Creed (in its damnatory clause, which was afterwards omitted) frequently use *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* (*substantia* and *persona* synonymously, and that the two terms were not clearly distinguished till the latter part of the fourth century.

§ By Paschas. Quesnel. Diss. xiv. ad Opera Leonis M. p. 384 sqq., Natalis Alexander, Pagi, Dupin, Tillemont (doubtful), Heidegger, Cave, Bingham, Oudin. So also Neander, in his posthumous work on Doctrine History, edited by Jacobi, Vol. I, p. 323, where he says that this Symbol was made most probably in the fifth century in the North African Church by Vigilius Tapsensis during

434;\* Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, about 570;† Hilarius Arelatensis, about 429;‡ Hilarius Pictaviensis, about 354; Victricius, confessor and bishop of Rouen, 401;§ Eusebius Vercellensis, 354; pope Anastasius I., 398; Athanasius, bishop of Speier, in Germany, 642. Others assign the symbol indefinitely to some Gallican divine,|| or to Spanish origin;¶ others less indefinitely to an unknown Latin father; \*\* while still others leave the authorship entirely doubtful.††

the renewal of the Arian controversy under the rule of the Vandals. The principal argument for this view is taken from the similarity of thought and style and the occurrence of the passage: "Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus S.; Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus Spiritus S.; Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus S." But similar passages are already found in Augustine's work *De Trinitate*. Vigilius is supposed by some to be the author of the twelve books *De Trinitate*, which go under the name of Athanasius, and also of the Dialogues between Athanasius, Arius, and Sabellius (in the 8th vol. of the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*.)

\* By Jos. Anselmi, on the ground especially of some resemblance between the Symbol. Athan. and the *Communitorium* of Vincentius.

† By Muratori. Venantius Fortunatus was the first commentator, rather than author of this Creed. Waterland justly raises the objection to the view of Muratori: "Who can imagine Venantius Fortunatus to have been so vain as, after commenting on the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, to fall to commenting on a composition of his own?"

‡ By Waterland, ch. VII and VIII. He tries to prove that there is nothing in the Athan. Creed but what might have been said and had been said by Catholic writers before the time of Nestorius; but that the Creed wants many of those particular and critical expressions of the Nestorian age, especially the designation of Mary as the *mother of God*, and that, consequently, it was composed before the Ephesian Council in 431, which condemned Nestorius. But his arguments for Hilary as the author are vague and inconclusive. They are as follows: 1. Hilary was made bishop of Gaul about 429. 2. He was a man of learning and elegant style. 3. He wrote a few small but fine tracts, and an exposition of the Creed. 4. He was a great admirer of Augustine. 5. He was well acquainted with Vincentius Lirinensis, having been first abbot of Lerin. 6. The style of the few of his writings corresponds well with the vigorous, sententious style of the Athanasian Creed. But these reasons are more than counterbalanced by the consideration: 1. That if Hilary composed this Creed at the time of his elevation to the episcopate in 429 or 430, it must have become known, as he lived till 449, the acknowledged head of the Gallican hierarchy, and the prominent champion of Gallican independence of the jurisdiction of Rome in the famous controversy with Leo I, who had so much to do with the settlement of the christological controversy at the Council of Chalcedon; 2. The Creed of a prelate who was excommunicated by the pope for insubordination to the holy see, and charged with diabolical pride, could not have obtained such currency and authority throughout the Catholic church, including Rome, except on the ground of the complete obscurity of its origin, which is extremely unlikely in this case, for the reason already mentioned.

§ By Harvey: "The Hist. and Theol. of the three Creeds," vol. II. p. 583 f., but without any solid argument. || So Pitheous, Vossius, Montfaucon, Kœllner.

¶ Gieseler.

\*\* Pearson, and Fabricius.

†† Patavius, Taylor, Cudworth, Tentzel, Tillemont, Clarke, Buddeus, Walch.

This very diversity of opinion shows that we do not know the real author. Even the arguments in favor of the claims of Vigilius Tapsensis, and of Hilarius Arelatensis, which are the most plausible, prove only the possibility, not even the probability of his authorship.

The case seems to us almost parallel with that of the Apostles' Creed, and in a less degree also with that of the Nicene Creed, and we are surprised that none of the numerous writers on this subject, as far as we can see, has directed attention to this fact.

The Apostles' Creed, it is now universally admitted, cannot be traced to the Apostles,\* nor to any particular author, age or country, but must be regarded as the production of the ancient Catholic Church. Its living root and substance goes back, indeed, to the Apostolic age, to the baptismal formula (Matth. xxviii : 19), and the confession of Peter (Matth. xvi : 16). But its present form is the result of a gradual and imperceptible growth which can be traced through the various and yet essentially identical rules of faith or baptismal Creeds of the second and third centuries, as found in the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and which attained its maturity towards the end of the third, or at all events at the beginning of the fourth century, before the Council of Nice, in 325, the Nicene Creed being an expansion and more explicit definition of the Apostles' Creed.†

As to the origin of the Nicene, or rather Nicaeno-Constanti-

---

\* As was done first by the presbyter, Rufinus of Aquileja, about 400, in his Exposition of the Creed. He represents it as the joint production of the twelve Apostles before leaving Jerusalem, each contributing one article, and thus explains the word *συμβολον*, taking it in the sense of *συμβολή*, *collatio*, while in fact it means sign, distinctive mark, form of confession. This tradition became soon current in the fifth century, and obtained to the fifteenth, when Laurentius Valla, and subsequently Erasmus undermined it.

† On the particulars of the origin, history and character of the Apostles' Creed, we must refer to the following treatises: Rufinus: *Expositio in Symbolum Apostolicum* (in the works of Hieronymus). Augustinus: *De Fide et Symbolo*. Heidegger: *De Symb. Apost.* Gisb. Voëtius: *De Symb. Apost.* Herm. Witsius: *Exersitationes sacrae in Symbolum quod apostolorum dicitur*. J. Pearson: *Exposition of the Creed*. P. King: *The History of the Apostles' Creed*. Koellner: *Symbolik aller Christl. Confessionen*, vol. I, p. 6 sqq. J. W. Nevin, *The Apostles' Creed*, three articles in the *Mercersburg Review* for 1849.

nopolitan Creed, we can speak more definitely. We know the precise time of its composition : it was formed at Nice in 325, and completed at Constantinople in 381, with the exception of the clause *filioque*, which is a later addition of the Latin church and became a bone of contention between it and the Greek church. We can go further and say that the formula proposed by Eusebius of Caesarea at Nicæa, was, in all probability, made the basis of the first draft. But this was shaped into a far more definite, anti-Arian character, especially by the insertion of the famous predicate of the Son : *homousios*, or *consubstantialis, co-equal, of one substance* with the Father, which Eusebius wished to avoid in the interest of peace. Half a century afterwards the Constantinopolitan Council made an important addition concerning the Holy Ghost, called forth by the intervening doctrinal controversies, and omitted the concluding anathema. Thus even this symbol, though less popular than the Apostolicum, can by no means be traced to any individual author, but must be regarded as the joint product of the Nicene age or of the first two ecumenical Synods.\*

We may illustrate the formation of the Nicene Creed by alluding to the official reports and acts of our ecclesiastical and political assemblies. Important matters are generally first referred to a committee of three, five, or more persons, with a responsible chairman. He draws up a report, submits it to the other members of the committee for approval, rejection, or revision, which may result in a radical reconstruction. Then it is brought up before the general body for action, and there it again undergoes, in many cases, a variety of changes before it is finally adopted. At all events, if adopted, it ceases to be the work of an individual, or even a committee, and becomes the property of the whole body, clothed with all the weight and authority which it may possess.

Now, as the Apostles' Creed is the work of the ante-Nicene

---

\* The origin and history of the Nicene Creed is more fully discussed by Vossius, Usher, Bingham, Heidegger, Walther, Baier, Blanchini, Suicer, Walch, Kœllner, and others. See the literature in Walch : *Introductio in libros symbolicos*, p. 121 sqq., and in Kœllner, *Symbolik*, etc., I, p. 6, and p. 28.



age, and the Nicene Creed the work of the Nicene age, so the Athanasian Creed may justly be called the work of the post-Nicene age, or of the Catholic church from the close of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century. Its germ as to substance may indeed be traced back to Athanasius, and so far it may still go under his name, but it is more directly derived from the later development of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Latin church, especially the school of Augustine, who first clearly taught the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit. Several passages are taken word for word from Augustine's work *De Trinitate*, which was not completed before 415. Ambrose, also, Vincentius Lirinensis, and Vigilius of Tapsus, furnish parallel passages. It presupposes not only the Arian, Semi-Arian, Apollinarian, but probably also the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, and the first four general councils, none of which alludes to it, although such allusion, if the work existed already, could hardly have been avoided. Its composition, therefore, must be placed probably after the year 451, when the Council of Chalcedon settled that very doctrine of the two natures in Christ's person, which is so distinctly expressed in this Creed. At all events, we cannot well date it beyond the time of the third general council at Ephesus in 431. The absence of the term *Mater Dei*, *theotokos*, proves no more its priority to that council, than the absence of the term *consubstantialis*, *homoousios* proves its composition before the council of Nice.

On the other hand the Creed under consideration cannot be carried down to a much later period, since it contains no allusion to the later Monophysite controversies, which gave rise to the fifth general council at Constantinople in 553, and still less to the Monothelite controversy concerning the two *wills* of Christ, which commenced in 633, and was finally settled by the sixth general Council in 680. We assign it, therefore, to the second half of the fifth century, or the beginning of the sixth.\* About 570, Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poi-

\*I cannot agree with Dr. Gieseler (Kirchengeschichte II, § 12. p. 109, note 7, fourth ed.) who thinks that the Athanasianum cannot be traced beyond the

tiers, wrote a commentary on the Creed, which implies its public use at the time.

The *place* of composition cannot be decided with any degree of certainty. It may have been written in North Africa, the country of Augustine, or in Spain, but more probably in Gaul, where it first spread and found favor, and where Augustine's writings exerted great influence in the fifth and sixth centuries.

This view of the case is sustained by the manner in which the Athanasian Creed comes to notice. It appears not in full at once, but gradually as it were. We meet first single words and passages of it in Ambrose, and especially in Augustine, in several writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, as Vincentius Lirinensis of Gaul (about 430), Vigilius Tapsensis, of Africa (484),\* Avitus Viennensis, of Gaul (500),† Cæsarius Arlatensis, of Gaul (520),‡ Venantius Fortunatus, of Gaul (570),§ and also in acts of Councils, especially the Councils of Toledo in Spain, of the seventh century.¶ Then we have it in full in

eight century, and who regards all the earlier allusions to it uncertain. He inclines to the opinion that it originated in Spain, where the conflict between the Athanasian and the Arian party continued longer than in any other country. But the majority of critics assign it to an earlier period, and to Gaul.

\* Compare the passage already referred to.

† Who uses the terms *nec factus, nec creatus, nec genitus*, of the Holy Ghost.

‡ In a sermon which found its way among those of St Augustine (Opera, tom. V. p. 399.) but which the Benedictine editors of Augustine, also Oudin, Waterland, and Kœllner, (l. c. p. 60) ascribe to Cæsarius of Arles (503-543). There occurs the first clear allusion which sounds like a direct quotation from the Athanasianum, as Gieseler admits, who, however, doubts the authorship of Cæsarius. It reads thus (we italicize the words corresponding to the symbol): "*Rogo et admoneo vos, Fratres carissimi, ut Quicumque vult saluus esse, Fidem rectam et Catholicam discat, firmiter teneat inviolatamque conservet.—Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus; sed tamen non tres Dii, sed unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus. Attamen credat unusquisque fidelis, quod Filius æqualis est Patri secundum divinitatem, et minor est Patre secundum humanitatem carnis, quam de nostro assumpsit.*"

§ Who is supposed by Muratori, Waterland, and Kœllner to be the author of the *Expositio fidei catholice*, which assumes already the general reception of the Symbolum Quicumque, and defends the *filioque*. For this reason Gieseler denies said Expositio to Fortunatus, but without being able to assign it to any other source. The brief *Expositio* of Venantius is published by Muratori, in the second tome of his *Anecdota*, and more correctly by Waterland, in an Appendix to his essay on the Athan. Creed (Works, vol. III. p. 257-268).

|| Conc. Tolet. IV. (anno 633) cap. I. Conc. Tolet. VI. (a. 638) c. I. Conc. Tolet. XI. (a. 675) præf., and C. T. XIV. (a. 684) c. 8. The close relation between these councils and several passages of the Athanasianum is undeniable,

a number of Latin manuscript copies, the precise age of which, however, it is impossible, in most cases, to fix with any degree of certainty. Waterland gives a full account of them in the fourth chapter of his treatise. The oldest, which is now lost, is assigned to the year 600,\* the next to 660,† the third to 700,‡ the fourth to 703,§ etc. The last mentioned is the first copy which ascribes the symbol to Athanasius, though in a somewhat equivocal way, by calling it the "*Fuith* of Saint Athanasius." There is also a famous manuscript of Charlemagne, at the end of the Gallican Psalter, written in letters of gold, and presented by Charlemagne to Pope Adrian I, A. D. 772. It is deposited in the library of Vienna, and bears the title: *Fides sancti Athanasii episcopi Alexandrini*.

If this view of the gradual composition of this Creed be correct, the *Symbolum Quicunque* is less individual and more catholic in its very origin, than any other confession of Christendom, with the only exception of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. This fact does not weaken, but rather strengthen its authority as a confession of faith. If Athanasius were an inspired apostle, then the case would be very different. But as all the teachers of the church, since the apostles, are fallible men, their writings carry no more weight and authority with them than their merits justify, and the church has given them by its own consent. The validity and value of the

and the question is merely, whether the councils quote from the symbol without naming it, as most writers suppose, or whether the Symbol borrowed from the councils, as Gieseler (l. c. p. 110) thinks.

\* It is called *Codex Usser. I.* Archbishop Usser saw it in a *Psalterium Latino-Gallicum* of the *Bibliotheca Cottoniana*, and assigned it "tum ex antiquo picturae genere, tum ex literarum forma grandiuscula" to the age of Gregory I. (590-604). But it has since disappeared.

† The manuscript of Treves on the borders of Gaul and Germany.

‡ Ms. Ambros. in the Ambrosian library at Milan.

§ Cod. Usser. II (Cotton. I.) in a copy of the Gallican Psalter of King Aethelstan. Usser says of it, *De Symb.* p. 8: "*Psalterium illud anno aerae nostrae Christianae 703, longe ante Aethelstani regnantis tempora, ex regulis Calendario in libri initio subjunctis scriptum fuisse deprehendi.*" Waterland (l. c. ch. IV.) remarks: "The Psalter, wherein this Creed is, is the Gallican Psalter, not the Roman; the title is: *Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini*" This is the oldest manuscript of any we have extant (—Cod. Uss. I. being lost—) ascribing this Creed to Athanasius.

Athanasian Creed can in no case be made to rest on the authority of any individual, however great and good, and the more it is separated from individual authorship, the better for its catholic and churchly character.

#### RECEPTION AND AUTHORITY.

As soon as the Athanasian Symbol clearly appears in history, we find it in high esteem, and quietly assuming its position among the authoritative doctrinal and liturgical standards of the *Latin* church, without the sanction of a general council, but on account of its own intrinsic merit. It was first introduced in France about 550, then in Spain 630, in Germany 800, in England 880, in Italy 880, in Rome 930.\* The Roman church in this point did not lead, but follow public opinion. She was always more desirous of imposing her own faith and rites upon other churches, than of adopting any from them. The Creed was frequently commented upon,† embodied in copies of the Psalter and Breviary, ordered to be committed to memory by the priests, and introduced into the weekly or even daily worship.‡

In the Greek church the Athanasian Creed, when it first became known, after the tenth century, met with opposition, especially on account of the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Spirit *from the Son*, as well as from the Father.§ Subse-

---

\* See Waterland l. c. ch. VI., and Koellner p. 85.

† By Venantius Fortunatus, Hincmar, Bruno of Würzburg, Peter Abælard, St. Hildegard, Alexander ab Hales, John Wycliffe, and others. See an account of the older commentators in Waterland's essay, ch. III. (Works, vol. III. p. 134 sqq.)

‡ Hatto, bishop of Basle, A. D. 820: "Ut Fides S. Athanasii a sacerdotibus discatur et ex corde, die Dominico, ad Primam recitetur." A more explicit testimony for the liturgical use of this Creed in the French and English churches, is furnished by Abbo of Fleury about 997 (quoted by Koellner, p. 65). Of later usage Bona (Tract. de divina Psalmidia, p. 863) says: "Illud symbolum olim, teste Honorio, quotidie est decantatum, jam vero diebus Dominicis in totius coetus frequentia recitatur, ut sanctae fidei confessio ea die apertius celebretur."

§ Some Greek divines denied that Athanasius ever wrote it; others maintain ed that he was drunk when he composed it; still others that the Latins corrupted his Creed by the insertion of the *et filio*. The last is also asserted in the Confessio Metrophanis Critopuli. Comp. Kimmel's Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orient., P. II. p. 23. For an account of the different Greek translations and manuscripts, see Waterland. ch. V.

quently it was likewise introduced, but less extensively than in the Latin church, and with some alterations, and with the omission of the *et filio*, καὶ ἐν τοῦ υἱοῦ, (corresponding to the *filioque* in the Latin versions of the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Symbol).\*

From the Latin church the Athanasian Creed, together with the other two ecumenical Creeds, passed over into the orthodox Protestant churches, and was either separately and expressly acknowledged, or substantially incorporated into their doctrinal or devotional standards.

The Lutheran church received it among its symbolical books. Luther appreciated it highly, and was disposed to regard it as the most important and glorious production since the days of the Apostles.† The Augsburg Confession substantially repeats its doctrine of the Trinity, and of Christ's person, without naming it.‡ The Form of Concord distinctly recognizes it as Scriptural, true and authoritative.§ Hence it is found in all the editions of the "Book of Concord" as the third symbol of the Lutheran Confession.

The Reformed church of England gave it a place in the *Common Prayer Book*, and ordered it to be sung or said alternately by the minister and people, standing, in the morning service on several festival days, viz.: Christmas, the Epiphany, St. Matthias, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, John the Baptist, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude, St. Andrew, and on Trinity Sunday. In all these days it takes the place of the Apostles' Creed. Several of the most eminent divines of the Anglican church, as arch-

\* Bingham: "Presenter Graeci eo utuntur nonnullis additamentis aucto et aliquantum mutato."

† "Es ist also gefasset," he says, "dass ich nicht weiss, ob seit der Apostel Zeit in der Kirche des Neuen Testaments etwas Wichtigeres und Herrlicheres geschrieben sei." Comp. Luth. Opp. Hal. VI. 2313 sqq.

‡ Art. I. and Art. III. (p. 9 and 10, ed. Hase).

§ Epit. p. 571, and more fully in the Solida Declar. p. 632 (ed. HASE): "Amplectimur etiam tria illa Catholica et generalia summae auctoritatis Symbola, Apostolicum, videlicet, Nicenum et Athanasii. Haec enim agnoscimus esse breves quidem, sed easdem maxime pias, atque in verbo Dei solide fundatas, praeclaras Confessiones fidei, quibus omnes haereses, quae iis temporibus Ecclesias Christi perturbarunt, perspicue et solide refutantur."

bishop Usher, bishop Pearson, and especially Dr. Waterland, the learned champion of the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Trinity against the high Arianism of Dr. Samuel Clarke, have commented on it and defended its contents. Even R. Baxter embraced it "as the best explication of the Trinity," provided, however, that "the damnatory sentences be excepted, or modestly expounded."\*

The Reformed churches of the Continent have not given the Athanasian Symbol that direct formal sanction and prominence, as the Lutheran and the Anglican.† But they unanimously profess, in their symbolical books, the same doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation; reject the errors of the Arians, Semi-Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians and Monothelites, and thus acknowledge in fact, if not always in form, the authority of the ancient ecumenical Creeds, in due subjection, of course, to the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures. The Second Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Bullinger in the name of the Swiss churches in 1566, and approved by them, endorses, in very strong and unmistakeable terms, the doctrine of the first four general councils and of the Athanasian Symbol.‡ Dr. David Pareus, the pupil and friend of Ursinus, and editor of his Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, wrote a special exposition of the Athanasian Creed,

\* As quoted by Waterland (works, vol. III. p. 251).

† Dr. Ebrard, on the contrary, thinks that the Reformed church makes in some respects even more account of the ecumenical Creeds than the Lutheran (Christl. Dogmatik, vol. II., p. 89 and 90). This may be true as to the doctrine itself, but not as to the formal recognition of these Creeds. Dr. Ebrard has overlooked the distinct recognition in the passage just quoted, in the preceding note, from the Lutheran Form. of Concord, and the somewhat disrespectful manner in which Calvin at least (*De vera ecclesiae Reformatione*) speaks of the Symb. Nicaenum as a "carmen cantillando magis aptum, quam confessionis formula."

‡ Cap. XI. (p. 487 in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confess. in Eccl. Reform. public.*): "Quaecunque de Incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi mysterio definita sunt ex Scripturis sanctis, et comprehensa symbolis ac sententiis quatuor primarum et praerantissimarum Synodorum celebratarum *Nicaeae, Constantinopolitanae, Ephesiae et Chalcedonensis*, una cum beati Athanasii Symbolo, et omnibus his similibus symbolis, credimus corde sincero et ore libero ingenue profiteri, condemnantes omnia his contraria. Atque ad hunc modum retinemus inviolatam sive integram fidem Christianam, orthodoxam atque catholicam: scientes symbolis praedictis nihil contineri, quod non sit conforme verbo Dei, et prorsus faciat ad sinceram fidei explicationem."

which, however, I have never seen.\* Henry Heidegger of Zurich, in a special dissertation quoted above, defends the doctrine of the Creed against the objections of Dudithius and other Anti-Trinitarians, and concludes with a running comment upon the whole.

So far the faith in the doctrines of our symbol was unshaken in the church, and was shared in common by the Greeks, (if we leave out of view their dissent from the *filioque*), Romans, and Protestants. The Socinians alone differed from it, and prepared the way for a still greater dissent. During the seventeenth century the origin of the Athanasian Creed was first made the subject of critical investigation by Continental and Anglican divines, and resulted in the almost unanimous rejection of the ancient tradition as to its authorship. This had the effect to weaken its authority as a primitive symbol, without undermining the faith in its contents. But when the skeptical and rationalistic flood of the eighteenth century swept away from a large portion of the church the orthodox faith in the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Son of God, this Creed was almost forgotten, and figured only in church histories among the many idle fabrications of a superstitious and intolerant age.

The reviving faith of the nineteenth century led to a gradual return to the ancient Confessions, first of the period of the Reformation, and then also to those of the primitive church. And although the Athanasian Creed is still comparatively neglected, and even passed by in silence by eminent writers † on the very doctrines it so ably and clearly sets forth, it begins again to attract attention more and more, and to be

---

\* *Symbolum Athanasii, notis breviter declaratum.* Heidelb. 1618 (as Walch has it, l. c. p. 156), or 1619 (according to Kœllner, p. 87. Probably the one gives the date of the preface, the other the date of publication.) Waterland (p. 251) refers to an edition of 1634.

† Dr. Baur, in his learned and eminently scholarly, though unsound, work on the history of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of God, alludes to this Creed only *en passant* in a foot note, Vol. II. p. 33, and p. 168. But what is more surprising still is, that Dr. Dorner, in his invaluable Christological work, should not even mention it, so far as we can see, from a cursory glance over both volumes and the index.



appreciated in its true worth without being unduly overestimated as in times past. Dr. Kling, an Evangelical divine of Würtemberg, claims for it a permanent significance in the Christian church, which will never give up its dogmatic substance.\* Dr. Ebrard, one of the leading representatives of the modern German Reformed school of theology, makes still greater account of it in his "Christian Dogmatics."† He represents it as the completion of the ancient Catholic theology and christology, and asserts that it has been most fully taken up and best understood by the symbols and early divines of the Reformed communion.

As to America, I am not aware that the Athanasian Creed has ever been made the subject of serious discussion.‡ The Episcopal church, at its separate organization after the revolutionary war, threw it out of its Liturgy, together with the Nicene Creed (the latter, however, was subsequently restored at the instance of the English bishops). But this omission must be traced to the prevalence of the latitudinarian spirit of the eighteenth century, which proposed, in the General Convention held at Philadelphia in 1785, a number of other omissions and changes in the Liturgy, the Thirty Nine Articles, and even in the Apostles' Creed.§ If the Episcopal church were to be reorganized now, as it was in 1784, the Athanasian Creed, as well as the Nicene, would probably keep its place in the Liturgy, and many of its ministers would gladly see it restored. The Lutherans of the United States are still bound to this Creed as far as they respect at all the Book of Concord. The Presbyterians and Congregationalists never, as far as I know, acknowledged it in form, but their standards

---

\* Art. in Herzog's Encyclopaedia vol. I, p. 577.

† Vol. I. § 138 p. 185 sq., u. vol II., § 377, p. 89 sq.

‡ Dr. Shedd gives a brief notice of it in the last book of his History of Christian Doctrine, vol. II., p. 439. He correctly says, that it embodies the Trinitarianism of the School of Augustine and Hilary, and the results of the Ephesian and Chalcedonian councils respecting the Person of Christ.

§ Comp. on this subject bishop White's Memoirs of the Prot. Episc. Ch. in the U. S. of A. Phil., 1820, p. 102 sqq. and 488 sqq., and the "Proposed Book," i. e., the provisional Liturgy of that church as revised by the Convention of 1785. Many of the alterations, especially also the omission of the Nicene Creed,

teach substantially the same doctrine. The Dutch Reformed church has it as an appendix to its Liturgy, although it is probably never used there in public service. The new Liturgy of the German Reformed church, 1857, which is as yet, however, merely of a provisional character, received it, together with the two older ecumenical Creeds, among the Primitive Forms, and recommends its use on the last communion in the ecclesiastical year. This is a step in advance of the other Protestant communions of the country, and just the reverse of the negative action of the Episcopal church in 1785; but, as compared with the original position and doctrinal standards of the churches of the Reformation, Lutheran, Anglican and Reformed, it is certainly no innovation, but a return rather to old usage under a modified, and we may say simplified and restricted form as to its actual use in public service. Whether the Athanasianum will retain its place at the final revision of this liturgy, remains to be seen. The more closely it is examined, the less objectionable will it appear to those who cherish a strong and hearty belief in the ancient Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the incarnation of the Son of God.

#### CHARACTER AND CONTENTS.

Let us now examine the theology of the Athanasian symbol, the nature of which must determine its value and use in the Christian church.\*

The third ecumenical Creed is an epitome of ancient Catholic theology, and sets forth, in clear logical statement, the orthodox faith concerning the fundamental articles of the triune God and the divine-human Saviour, without attempting to explain these unfathomable mysteries. It embodies the permanent results of the trinitarian and christological controversies

---

and the article on the descent into hades in the Apostles' Creed, were subsequently given up, on the remonstrance of the English bishops, who refused ordination, except on condition of the restoration of that article, and of the Nicene Creed.

\* On the theology of the Creed, which we regard as the most important part of the subject, Walch and Koellner are altogether superficial and unsatisfactory. Waterland gives a brief, Harvey (vol. II., p. 585-695) gives a more extended commentary on it.

which agitated, with uncommon violence, the Nicene and post-Nicene age, and were decided successively by the four general Synods held at Nicæa in 325, at Constantinople in 381, at Ephesus in 431, and at Chalcedon in 451.

For all practical purposes we may say the Apostles' Creed was sufficient, and it is so to this day, as a guide for catechetical instruction of the young, and as a confession at baptism and communion. In this respect it can never be superseded or improved. Its very simplicity gives it a decided preference for popular catechetical and liturgical use over the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, and every subsequent confession of faith. But theologically and scientifically considered, it is defective, inasmuch as it does not clearly and unmistakeably teach the Godhead of Christ and of the Holy Ghost in the full sense in which the church intended it from the beginning.

Hence it was found necessary to define it more fully at the councils of Nicæa and Constantinople, in opposition to the Arian and Semi-Arian hypothesis which acknowledged Christ to have existed before the world and to be divine in some sense, but denied his equality with the Father, and which made the Holy Ghost the first creature of the Son, or a mere power and influence of the Godhead. The Nicene Creed calls Jesus Christ not simply the "only begotten Son our Lord," as the Apostles' Creed does, but the "only begotten Son of God; begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of one substance (*homoousios*) with the Father, by whom all things were made." This is certainly an advance, not in faith, we may say, for this was the same in the beginning, but in knowledge and in expression.

But the theology of the church could not stop here. The Nicene Creed, even in the more explicit form which it received at the Synod of Constantinople in 381, teaches, indeed, the true Godhead of Christ beyond the possibility of mistake, but it gives by no means yet a complete view of the holy Trinity. For in the first place, like the Apostles' Creed, it speaks of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost separately, with-

out bringing out their oneness of substance, their mutual relations and distinctive personal properties, so as to exclude every possible form of tritheism on the one hand and subordinationism on the other. Secondly, it is especially defective in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, which did not come into full view at all during the Arian controversy. In the third place it is entirely silent on the exact relation which holds between the divine and human nature of Christ, which was brought out only during the succeeding Nestorian and Eutychian controversies.

In all these respects, and especially in the last, the Athanasian symbol is a decided advance upon its two predecessors. It naturally divides itself into two parts. Each part is introduced by a prologue on the necessity and importance of holding the true faith as afterwards taught, and the whole concludes with an epilogue to the same effect. The first, and larger part, from v. 3-27,\* teaches the true doctrine of the Trinity; the second, from v. 26-44, the doctrine of the incarnation, or the proper constitution of Christ's person.

1. The doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY, or the theology, in the strict sense of the term.

The Holy Trinity is the sacred symbol and type of the Christian religion, as distinct from the abstract monotheism of Judaism, Mohammedanism, and deism on the one hand, and from the dualism and polytheism of the various forms of paganism on the other. It comprehends all the truths and all the blessings of the revelation or self-communication of God for the salvation of men. Hence it is expressed in the baptismal formula, and confessed in the Apostles' Creed at the very entrance into the Christian church in the sacrament of baptism (Matth. xxviii. 19), and made the all-comprehending and concluding benediction by the apostle (2 Cor. xiii. 14). It stands thus at the

---

\* The division in verses differs somewhat, although the succession is the same in all manuscripts and editions. The Book of Concord makes 42 verses, Weber 43. The best critical edition of the text is said to be that of Waterland. But the Latin codices of which Montfaucon compared 12, Waterland 24, present a very small number of lectiones variantes, while the Greek copies, though less numerous, (8), differ more materially.

beginning and at the end of Christian worship, and controls it throughout. But it is not simply in the two express passages alluded to, that the Bible teaches the holy trinity, nor in all the far more numerous passages which prove the Godhead of Christ or of the Holy Ghost, and which can only be reconciled with the fundamental idea of the Divine unity on the assumption of a trinity of persons in this unity of substance. We may say the doctrine runs through the entire Scriptures from beginning to end in the form of living facts, or in the exhibition of the revelation of the one only true and living God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost in the work of the creation, redemption and sanctification of the world. We need not be surprised, therefore, that this article stands out so prominently in the faith, worship and theology of the early church, and gave rise to a long succession of doctrinal controversies. In this article again the divinity of Christ, as the incarnate God and Saviour of the race, formed naturally the central interest and fills the greater portion of the ancient Creeds, since it is the starting point of the Christian consciousness, determines the true idea of God, and was the main object of attack on the part of the ancient heresies, both of Jewish and heathen origin.

The Holy Trinity is a mystery which transcends our present power of comprehension, and will furnish food for sacred meditation and praise throughout the countless ages of eternity. Nevertheless, as faith, though superrational and supernatural, is never irrational and unnatural, the subject matter of this article of faith can and ought to be clearly known and stated.

This is done with admirable clearness, precision, brevity, and completeness in the Athanasian Creed. It betrays a mind which had evidently mastered the entire subject and fully appropriated it to the intellect as well as to the heart. It not only rejects *Unitarianism* or *Monarchianism*, which either as *Patrippassianism*, or as *Ebionism*, denies the Trinity altogether, but it avoids, also, with singular care and discrimination, the three erroneous forms in which the Trinity may be held and has been held at different times before and since. It excludes,

in the first place, *Sabellianism* or *Modalism*, which teaches only a nominal distinction in the Godhead, or at best, merely a trinity of revelation, not of essence, and thus falls back at last upon Unitarianism, or abstract Monotheism ; secondly, *Tritheism*, which teaches three divine beings, and thus runs into polytheism ; and thirdly, *Subordinationism*, which subordinates the Son to the Father, and the Holy Ghost to both, as partaking in part only, as it were, or to a limited extent, of the divine essence, or dignity. These errors are not expressly mentioned, but necessarily denied by the positive statement of the opposite view.

The Symbol teaches the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity, neither dividing the substance, nor confounding the persons.\*

1. *The Unity* of the Godhead as to being, substance or essence : "The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the glory equal, the majesty co-equal. . . There are not three eternal, but one eternal. . . not three uncreated, nor three unlimited ; but one uncreated, and one unlimited ; . . not three almighties, but one almighty ; . . not three Gods, but one God ; . . not three Lords, but one Lord. . . We are forbidden by the Catholic religion to say : There are three Gods, or three Lords."

2. *The Trinity* of persons, or hypostases. These terms, it is true, must be taken in a peculiar sense, if applied to God. For in human relations three persons constitute three different beings. Yet there is no other term equally expressive. The Trinity is in the first place immanent and essential, a distinction in God himself, independent of, and prior to, his manifestation in the world. It is a living relationship and process in God, the vitality, so to say, of infinite intelligence and infinite love. God was from everlasting Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and will remain forever Father, Son, and Holy

\* V. 3 and 4. In v. 27, there is an unimportant difference of reading as to the order. The *textus receptus*, as found in the Book of Concord, reads, *trinitas in unitate et unitas in trinitate*, while Waterland reverses the order, *unitas in trinitate et trinitas in unitate*. The latter is the order in the old English version and in the revision.

Ghost as certainly as he is supreme wisdom and supreme love. This Trinity of constitution reflects and manifests itself in the economical Trinity, or Trinity of revelation,\* that is the three-fold divine work of creation, salvation, and sanctification. "There is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. . . The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. . . Each person by himself is God and Lord."

3. The internal *relation* of the three persons or their distinctive properties which, however, do not in the least interfere with the strict unity of substance. The Father is himself not made, nor created, nor begotten, but eternally *begetting* the Son; the Son is not made, nor created, but eternally *begotten* of the substance of the Father; the Holy Ghost is not made, nor created, but eternally *proceeding* from the Father and the Son.† It is true, in this last point there is a difference of opinion between the Greek and the Latin church, the former denying the procession from the Son as a later innovation and corruption. But the equality of the Son and the Father in its full sense necessarily requires the *filioque*. Here the Athanasianum follows the Latin view as brought out especially by St. Augustine,‡ and embodied also in the later clause to the Nicene Creed.

This same doctrine of the Trinity, including the *filioque*, was unanimously professed by the Reformers, reasserted in oppo-

\* We employ here a terminology which is much later, but the distinction itself between an essential or immanent Trinity, and an economical or transeunt Trinity enters unquestionably into the ancient Creeds and is implied already in the doctrine of the *eternal* generation of the Son, or the *eternal* Sonship of Christ.

† Or to express it in nouns according to a later terminology, to the Father belongs negatively the *innascibilitas* or ἀγεννησία, positively the *generatio activa* Filii and *spiratio activa*, (πνοή) Spiritus Sancti; to the Son belongs the *filatio* or *generatio* (γεννησία) passiva, and *spiratio activa* Spiritus S.; to the Holy Ghost the *processio* (ἐκπορεύσις) and *spiratio passiva*.

‡ Com. Augustin, de Trinit. IV, 20: "Nec possumus dicere, quod Spiritus S et a Filio non procedat; neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video, quid aliud significare voluerit, quum sufflans in faciem discipulorum ait: Accipite Spiritum S. Neque enim flatus ille corporeus substantia Spiritus S. fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre, sed et a Filio procedere Spiritum."



sition to the Socinians, and incorporated into the doctrinal standards of the Evangelical churches. Hase says that the view of the Athanasian symbol "was received *without change* into the symbolical books of the Lutheran church, and defended as the most sacred mystery of orthodox Christendom against every kind of opposition."\* The Reformed church, in some of its standards, is even more full and clear on the subject than the Lutheran.† Let us hear the four Reformed symbols which are most extensively used and enjoy the greatest authority, the second Helvetic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession.

The larger Helvetic Confession not only expressly endorses the ancient symbols, including the Athanasianum, as we have observed already, but also, in its exposition of the Trinity, is so clear and explicit as to leave no room for doubt whatever.‡ "We believe and teach that God is one as to essence and nature (*unum esse essentia vel natura*), self-subsisting and self-sufficient for all things, invisible, incorporeal, immense, eternal, the creator of all things visible as well as invisible, the highest good. . . . Nevertheless, we believe and teach that this same infinite God one and undivided (*unum et undivisum*) is inseparably and without confusion distinct in persons (*personis inseparabiliter et inconfuse esse distinctum*) as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so that the Father from eternity begat the Son (*ab aeterno Filium generaverit*), that the Son was begotten by an ineffable generation (*Filius generatione ineffabili genitus sit*), and that the Holy Ghost eternally proceeds from both, and is to be adored with both (*Spiritus S. vero procedat ab utroque, idque ab aeterno, cum utroque adorandus*); so that there are not three Gods, but three persons consubstantial, co-eternal and co-equal, distinct as to hypostases, and in order

---

\* Hutterus Redivivus, oder Dogmatik der Evang. Luth. Kirche, p. 171 of the 8th ed. Comp. his quotations from the Augsb. Conf., the Apology, and the old Lutheran divines, on the subsequent pages. Also Hase's Evang. Dogmatik, p. 515, 4th ed.: "Die hergebrachte Lehre ging ohne alle Durchbildung in die evang. Kirche ueber, theils durch Reception des Athanasianum, theils durch Wiederholung seines Grundgedankens, wie seiner praktischen Anwendung."

† Comp. Ebrard l. c. I. p. 186 sqq. ‡ Cap. 3, p. 470 ed. Niemeyer.

(or dignity) one preceding the other, yet without any inequality (*nulla tamen inaequalitate*)." Then the Confession quotes several Scripture passages in support of this doctrine, and condemns not only the Jews and Mohammedans and all who blaspheme "*sacrosanctam et adorandam hanc Trinitatem*," but also those heretics who deny or pervert it, as the Monarchians, Patripassians, Sabellians, Arians, Macedonians, and the like.

The Heidelberg Catechism, necessarily more brief, but sufficient for its purpose, says, in the 25th Question: "Since there is but one divine essence, why speakest thou of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Because God has so revealed himself in his word, that these three distinct persons are the only true and eternal God."

The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England recognize the Athanasian Creed,\* and teach in the very first article, which is retained unchanged in the Episcopal Church of the United States: "There is but one living and true God. . . . And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The Church of England has given the Athanasian Creed a permanent place in her Book of Common Prayer, and in her public worship.

The Westminster Confession, which is held by the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies of England, Scotland, and the United States, approaches more closely to the phraseology and letter of the Athanasian Creed:† "In the unity of the Godhead

---

\* Art. VIII "of the Three Creeds," in the original articles as they still obtain in England. The Episcopal Church of the United States has not only removed the Athanasian symbol from the liturgical service, but also stricken out its name from said article in the revision of 1801, retaining, however, the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, and also Art. I and II unaltered, which teach the same doctrine on the Trinity and the Incarnation.

† Chapt. II, § 3. Comp. the Larger Catech. Quest. VIII-XI.

The Westminster standards are hardly ever noticed by German writers, not even by Ebrard and Schweizer, in their works on Reformed Dogmatics, while they refer to every other symbol, the Scotch Confession among the rest, which was superseded by the far more full and accurate Westminster Confession and Catechisms. It is characteristic that Niemeyer, in his Collection of all the Reformed symbols, originally omitted the Westminster standards entirely, but furnished them afterwards in an Appendix, with the excuse that he was unable before to find a single copy of them any where (*quod ne unum quidem confes-*

there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten, nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."

Similar quotations might easily be multiplied, but it is not necessary, since the orthodoxy of the Protestant Evangelical churches on this article has never been seriously questioned, not even by Roman Catholic controversialists.

## II. The doctrine of the INCARNATION, or the CHRISTOLOGY.

The doctrine of Christ is substantially contained in the confession of Peter, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, *i. e.* the promised Messiah, the Son of the living God, or in the declaration of John: The word became flesh; or in the word of Paul: God manifest in the flesh. The church has ever believed in the mystery of the incarnation or the abiding union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, as the central truth of our holy religion and the foundation of all our hopes. Christ must be both the Son of God and the Son of man in the fullest sense of the term, if he really is what he claims to be, the Mediator between God and man, and the Saviour of the world. To deny either his divinity, or his humanity, to reduce him either to a mere man, however great and good, or to resolve him into a Gnostic phantom and spectral idea, is a radical heresy, and overthrows the Christian salvation. Hence the uncompromising hostility of the ancient church against Ebionism on the one hand, and Gnosticism on the other. But the exclusion of these two extreme errors is not sufficient. It may be admitted that Christ is both God and man, and yet the *relation* of the divine and human in him be so conceived as seriously to affect either their difference or their unity.

---

slonis Westmonasteriensis sive Puritanæ exemplar usquam reperire potueram). And yet the Westminster Assembly, next to the Synod of Dort, was the most important Protestant Synod ever held since the Reformation, and its doctrinal standards contain the best expressions of the Calvinistic system of theology, and are more extensively used in England, Scotland, and the United States, than any other symbolical book of Protestantism.

The difference may be made so great, as virtually to result in two persons, or the unity may be so pressed, as to teach but one nature. The former is the Nestorian, the latter the Eutychian or Monophysite error. The one allows merely a mechanical and external relation between the divine and human nature in Christ, and substitutes the idea of an indwelling of the former in the latter or of a moral fellowship for the idea of an incarnation. The other assumes a total absorption of the human nature into the divine in the act of the incarnation, so that Christ ceases to be man, and cannot be our model for imitation. In both cases the truth of the incarnation and its result, the redemption and reconciliation of man with God, are seriously endangered and virtually annihilated. Nestorianism falls back at last upon an Ebionite Christology, while Eutychianism ends logically in Gnosticism and Pantheism.

Here now the Athanasian Creed, in the second part, steers with equally sound instinct and discrimination between the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, as it steered in the doctrine of the Trinity between Tritheism and Unitarianism. It teaches that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, equal to the Father as to his divine nature, equal to man as to his human nature, sin only excepted, and yet one and the same Christ, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person,\* not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God.

It is interesting to compare with it the confession of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which rejected the Eutychian heresy, and gave at the same time an exposition of the orthodox doctrine in these words :

“ Following the holy fathers, we all teach and confess unanimously one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in Godhead, and perfect in manhood ; truly God, and at the same time truly man, of a reasonable soul and human body ; of the same substance with the Father as to

---

\* *Unus omnino, non confusione substantiae, sed unitate personae, v. 36.* This sounds like a direct denial of the Eutychian theory, and seems to point to a period after the fourth general Council in 451. But the same view was substantially advanced before Eutyches, and opposed in similar forms as in this passage. Comp. Waterland, l. c. p. 104 sqq. and Koellner, p. 89 sq.

his Godhead, and of the same substance at the same time with us as to his manhood; in all things like unto us, except sin; eternally begotten of the Father according to his Godhead, but in the last days, for our sake and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God (*τῆς θεοτόκου*), according to his manhood; one and the same Christ (*ὃν αὐτὸν X.*), Son, Lord, Only-begotten, who is known in two natures \* without mixture and change, † without division and separation, ‡ so that the difference of the natures is by no means abolished by the union, but rather the peculiarity of each nature is saved, and they are united into one person and one hypostasis; § not divided or torn into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-Begotten, and God-Logos, our Lord Jesus Christ: as the prophets from on high and the Lord Jesus Christ himself have taught us, and the faith of the fathers has handed down to us."

The statement of the Athanasian Creed is more simple and condensed and omits the term "mother of God," which is not to be regretted, || but it is equally, if not more clear and explicit. ¶ It also illustrates the relation of the two natures in Christ by the union of soul and body in man. It then enumerates, like the Apostles' Creed, the leading facts in the life of our Saviour to his return in glory, and concludes with the doctrine of the last judgment, where the good shall receive everlasting life and the wicked everlasting damnation.

\* *ἐν δύο φύσεσι*, in duabus naturis, as all Latin copies read, instead of the other reading, *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, which might be understood in a Eutychian or Monophysite sense.

† *ἀόνομηχρως, ἀτρέπως*—against Eutychianism.

‡ *ἀδιαίρετως, ἁχωρίστως*—against Nestorianism.

§ *εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν*.

|| It must be admitted that the term *θεοτόκος*, so obnoxious to the Nestorians, has a good sense, and follows with logical necessity from the orthodox view of the Incarnation. It is moreover properly qualified by the addition "according to his manhood." But it is equally certain that it is one-sided (*χριστοτόκος* and *θεανθρωποτόκος* would be more complete); that it was not used by the apostles and ante-Nicene fathers, nor by St. Augustine; that it is liable to be grossly misunderstood by the illiterate; that it has been greatly abused and made the basis of an excessive, yea idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin in the Greek and Roman churches. We prefer the Scriptural term, "Mother of our Lord," Luke i. 43.

¶ Waterland inferred from the omission of the term *Mater Dei*, *θεοτόκος*, which was the watchword of orthodoxy in its war against Nestorianism as the term *ὁμοούσιος* in the Arian conflict, that the Creed was composed before the condemnation of Nestorius in 431. But in this case we would expect some reference to it in the Councils of Ephesus 431, and of Chalcedon 451, or immediately afterwards. Such an excellent summary of orthodoxy could not well be long hidden from the churches, especially if it proceeded from such a distinguished prelate as Hilary of Arles, to whom Waterland ascribes it, though without good reason.

The Christology of the Athanasian Creed has likewise passed over, without any material change into the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. Leaving out of view the Lutheran doctrine, we shall confine ourselves again to the four leading confessions of the Reformed communion.

The Heidelberg Catechism teaches,\* that Christ as a Mediator and Deliverer must be *very man*, and perfectly righteous, because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which has sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin, and one who is himself a sinner, cannot satisfy for others; and that he must be at the same time *in one person very God*, that he might by the power of his Godhead sustain, in his human nature, the burden of God's wrath, and might obtain for us and restore to us righteousness and life.

The second Helvetic Confession,† after teaching distinctly the eternal generation of the Son and the strict equality with the Father, goes on as follows: "The same eternal Son of the eternal God, we believe and teach, has become the Son of man of the seed of Abraham and David, without the cohabitation of man, as Ebion said, being conceived in the purest manner, by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, according to the evangelical history." Then after rejecting the Gnostic and Appollinarian view of the humanity of Christ, it continues: "We acknowledge in one and the same Christ our Lord two natures, the divine and the human, and these we hold to be so connected that they are not absorbed, or confused, or mixed, but united or conjoined in one person, without destroying the permanent properties of the natures; so that we worship one Lord Christ, not two, who is very God, of one substance with the Father, according to his divine nature, and very man, of one substance with us men, according to his human nature, sin only excepted. Therefore we abominate the Nestorian dogma which makes two out of one Christ, and dissolves the unity of person; so also we utterly execrate

\* Quest. XV-XVIII. Comp. Qu. XXIX-XL.

† Cap. XI: De Jesu Christo vero Deo et homine, unico mundi Salvatore, p. 483 sq. ed. Niemeyer.

the folly of Eutyches, the Monophysites, and Monothelites who expunge the property of the human nature."

The Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Communion teach :\* "The Son, which is the word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance : so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man," etc.

The Westminster Confession is equally clear and distinct on this subject.† "The Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man's nature with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance : so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man."

The Shorter Catechism of Westminster gives one of the briefest and best statements of the orthodox doctrine of Christ's Person in these words : "The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who being the eternal Son of God became man, and so was and continues to be *God and man in two distinct natures and one person* forever." "This statement," as is justly observed by Dr. W. Cunningham, the late principal of New College of the Free Church in Scotland, "manifestly embodies the sum and substance of the decrees of the third and fourth ecumenical councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon in the fifth century, and cannot be explained and defended without a knowledge of those Scriptural

---

\* Art. II.

† Chapt. VIII, § 2.



grounds applicable to the subject on which the decisions of these councils were professedly based."\*

It is perfectly plain, then, that the theology and christology of the Athanasian symbol is to this day the public doctrine of the Protestant Evangelical as well as the Roman Catholic Churches. To recognize and acknowledge it in form is perfectly consistent with orthodox Protestantism. To reject it altogether, is at the same time to reject the corresponding articles of all our leading confessions of faith.

The only real difficulty in the way is the *damnatory* clause in the prologue and epilogue of the Athanasian Creed, which makes the eternal salvation dependent upon the reception of this faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. This is the great objection to this symbol even in the eyes of many who otherwise altogether agree with its contents. No doubt the objection would be serious and valid, if the damnatory clause referred to the *form* as well as to the *substance* of faith, and required us to condemn any particular *persons*, especially all those who held loose any unsatisfactory philosophical views on the Holy Trinity, as was the case even with most of the ante-Nicene fathers, not to speak of such men as Milton, Newton, Watts, Schleiermacher, Neander, Bushnell, and many other distinguished divines in the later ages of the Christian church. But this is a false interpretation of the clause. The more it is examined and understood in its proper sense, the less objectionable will it appear.

For in the first place, if faith is at all saving, the rejection of faith must be condemning. The assertion of truth is necessarily also the negation of error. There is no avoiding the conclusion. "He that believeth," says the highest authority, "and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."† "He that believeth on him, is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."‡

---

\* Historical Theology. Edinburgh, 1854. Vol. I. p. 310.

† Mark xvi: 16

‡ John iii. 18. Comp. v. 24; vi. 40 and 47.

Secondly, the energy and earnestness of faith in its negative as well as positive expression, must not be confounded with intolerance and uncharitableness. The question is here not of persons at all, but simply of truth and error. We are bound as Christians to love the sinner and heretic, and to labor for his conversion, while we should abhor and condemn his sin and error.

Thirdly, the Protestant symbols, both Lutheran and Reformed, do substantially the same thing which is found so objectionable in the Athanasian Creed. The Augsburg Confession, the Articles of Smalkald, the Form of Concord, the Helvetic, Gallic, Belgic, Scotch, and other Confessions, expressly condemn, in the strongest terms, such as *damnamus*, *abominamur*, *detestamur*, *execramur*, the trinitarian and christological heresies of the Gnostics, Docetists, Ebionites, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Servetians, Socinians, and others.

Finally, in all these cases salvation and condemnation is not made to depend upon the acceptance or rejection of the logical form of statement or any particular degree of knowledge of these mysteries, but only upon the presence or absence of faith in the doctrinal substance or the great truth contained in the statement. The form of expression is simply the outer hull to guard the kernel of truth against misapprehension and perversion. The strength and nourishment lies in the kernel, not in the hull. It is the truth alone, as apprehended by faith, which can save, and can save a child and a barbarian as well as the ripest and profoundest scholar. But what is the central truth, the main object of saving Christian faith? It is undoubtedly the one only true and living God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who made us, who redeemed us, and who sanctifies us, and the one Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man, the only Saviour. This is the faith taught in the Protestant confessions, as well as in the three ancient Creeds; this faith is necessary for salvation, while its wilful rejection must exclude from it; this faith will remain the same to the end of time, however much its philosophical apprehension and

logical expression may change and improve with the progressive march of theological science.\*

#### VALUE AND USE.

With this explanation of the damnatory clause we should think that no strong believer in the Trinity and the incarnation of the Son of God, as the fundamental doctrines of the holy Scriptures, can justly deny the Athanasian Creed a great and permanent value. Besides the formal recognition of it in the second Helvetic Confession and other symbolical books of the Reformed Church, it has long had a place in full in the Anglican and the Dutch Liturgies. It has also quite recently been embodied in the new hymn book and liturgy of the Reformed Church of Elberfeld, which is perhaps more strictly Reformed than any other congregation in Germany and Switzerland. This work, published in 1853, in addition to the Psalms and two hundred and forty-three well selected choice hymns, accompanied with the tunes, contains the Heidelberg Catechism, a number of prayers and short liturgical services, the three ancient Creeds, and also the doctrinal decisions of the councils of Ephesus A. D. 431, and of Chalcedon A. D. 451.

It is not intended, of course, to place these Creeds on a par with the holy Scriptures in a Romanizing sense, or to weaken in the least the fundamental Protestant principle concerning the rule of faith. The authority of the word of God is absolute, that of the Confessions of the church is relative only and conditioned by their agreement with it; the former is, strictly

---

\* Dr. Kling in his short article on the Athanasian Creed, in Herzog's Encyclopædia, takes the same view of the offensive clause: "Das Vorurtheil," he says, "wird schwinden in dem Maasse, als man sich darüber verständigen wird, dass es [the Athan. S.] uns nur angeht hinsichtlich seines wesentlichen dogmatischen Gehaltes, das heisst, insofern als es die Einheit der Gottheit in der dreifachen persönlichen Unterschiedenheit und umgekehrt, und die vollkommene Gottheit und vollkommene Menschheit des Einen untheilbaren Christus als unvermengt, unverwandelt und ungeschieden feststellt." . . . "Darin liegt seine bleibende Bedeutung, und nie wird sich die christliche Kirche diesen Gehalt und unser Symbolum, insofern es denselben in sich trägt, nehmen lassen, wie auch immer die positive theologische Vermittlung desselben sich ändern und vervollkommen mag."

speaking, the only rule of faith, the *norma normans fidei*, the latter are only exponents of the true sense of the Bible and safeguards of sound doctrine, the *norma normata doctrinae*.

Among these Confessions of faith the three symbols of the ancient church have always held, and should continue to hold, the highest place, because they are nearest the apostolic fountain; they really contain the fundamental articles of the Christian faith in the shortest and simplest form; they are ecumenical or universal, being received by all the branches of orthodox Christendom, and they form a link of union between the church of the present with the church of the past, up to the age of the confessors, martyrs and immediate disciples of the apostles. The most sacred associations of many centuries cluster around them; they are fraught with the piety, faith, hope, joy and spiritual experience of God's people of all generations and tongues. Why should the Athanasian Creed be banished from its former time-honored position, since it is only the legitimate completion of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, embodies, as we have seen, the purest results of the theology of the first five centuries, and gives the clearest and fullest expression to the church's faith in the triune God and the divine-human Saviour of the world—a faith so earnestly and emphatically reconfessed, as with one voice, by all the symbols of Evangelical Christendom.

In addition to their doctrinal value the ancient Creeds have also from time immemorial been used for liturgical purposes. Here a proper distinction must be made.

The Apostles' Creed stands decidedly first on account of its simplicity for all practical and popular use. It alone, as already intimated, is properly adapted for catechetical instruction, for baptism and confirmation, and should also be more frequently confessed than any other in the regular service of the Lord's day, as the solemn utterance of the common congregation and a united act of worship, like singing and prayer.

The Nicene Creed, being already more artificially constructed and rising somewhat in its terminology above the ordinary popular comprehension, should be confined to communion or

festival seasons, where it may take the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The Athanasian Symbol, finally, being still more theological and scientific in tone and expression, is scarcely appropriate for liturgical use at all, except perhaps on special occasions, or, as has been proposed, once a year on Trinity Sunday. It is intended more for the clergy than for the people. The frequent use of it in the mediæval Latin church, and in the Church of England, is to be attributed in part to the former scarcity of hymns, now so happily supplied by our rich treasures of sacred poetry, and can, therefore, not be taken as a precedent.

The most solemn and impressive form of professing the Creeds in public worship is the chanting by the choir, either alone or in connection with the whole congregation properly trained for responsive liturgical worship.

---

#### ART. V.—THE POLITICAL CRISIS.

BY GEORGE L. PRENTISS, D. D., New York City.

IN closing an article on the Political Situation, in the April number of this Review, we expressed our fervent hope "that Congress and the President might soon come to see eye to eye, and agree upon a joint policy which should be, like the wisdom from above, first pure, then peaceable, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."

We need not say how grievously this hope has been disappointed. The differences, which six months ago seemed not incapable of being reconciled, have since widened into an impassable chasm. The Executive and Legislative departments of the Government are arrayed against each other in open and determined conflict. Both have appealed to the country and already the popular verdict has begun to utter itself. The nation is in the midst of a political crisis as momentous as any

it has ever known. We propose to take a brief survey of the contest, and of the issues involved in it.

In our previous article we traced the President's policy down to the veto of the Civil Rights Bill. His message returning that bill left but little ground of hope that he would approve of any plan of restoration, which the wisdom of the National Legislature might devise. Everything, indeed, indicated that his mind was fully set in him to have his own way, in total disregard of the law-making power; and that his own way was to admit the States lately in insurrection to all their old rights and privileges, and to increased power in the Government, *without any further conditions or guarantees whatever*. He declared them (with the exception of Texas) to be already reconstructed, and as completely entitled to representation in either house of Congress as New York or Ohio. He had said, it is true, that they must present themselves "*in an attitude of loyalty*" as well as "in the persons of loyal representatives." But as he evidently considered himself the sole judge of the first qualification, and loudly proclaimed their loyalty to be unimpeachable,\* it only remained for Congress to look into the second. But here, again, there was an irreconcilable difference between the two branches of the Government. The word "loyal" was used by the President in a peculiar sense. He meant by it, as is now perfectly clear, anybody who, having been amnestied, or pardoned, professed approval of his "policy;" and this executive test Mayor Monroe, of New Orleans, or one of his "Thugs," could stand quite as well as Gov. Parsons and Gov. Orr. The Congressional test of a "loyal representative," on the other hand, was his ability to take the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution and the law of the land.† This oath, both in its letter and spirit, is in utter

\* "They (the late rebel States) are one and all in an attitude of loyalty towards the Government, and of sworn allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. In no one of them is there the slightest indication of resistance to this authority, or the slightest protest against its just and binding obligation. This condition of renewed loyalty has been officially recognized by solemn proclamation of the Executive department."—*Address of the Philadelphia Johnson Convention.*

† The oath is as follows: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I have never

antagonism to the policy of Mr. Johnson. Probably not half-a-dozen of all the claimants of seats from the South can take it without committing perjury ; and yet not a single one of these claimants but is an enthusiastic supporter of the President ; nor is there any reason to think that a single one of them all is regarded by him as disqualified to sit in the halls of National Legislation. How, then, can any loyal man be surprised that the breach between Congress and the Executive was not healed ? It could have been healed only by the former consenting to abandon the whole question of reconstruction to the discretion of Mr. Johnson, to abdicate to this end its functions as the supreme law-making power of the Nation, and to admit to seats on its floor men whose hearts and lips were still envenomed with disloyalty, provided only they brought in their hands the pardon, and praised the "policy," of the Executive ! Some have alleged, we are aware, that if Congress, early in the session, had decided upon the plan ultimately adopted, the President would, probably, have given it his approval ; for he had again and again expressed himself as in favor of every one of its principles. We cannot concur

---

voluntarily borne arms against the United States since I have been a citizen thereof ; that I have voluntarily given no aid, countenance, counsel, or encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostility thereto ; that I have neither sought nor accepted, nor attempted to exercise the functions of any office whatever, under any authority or pretended authority in hostility to the United States ; that I have not yielded a voluntary support to any pretended government, authority, power, or Constitution within the United States, hostile or inimical thereto. And I do further swear (or affirm) that, to the best of my knowledge and ability, I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, against all enemies, foreign and domestic ; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same ; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God."

"And why (it may be asked) did not Congress admit the few claimants who *could* honestly take this oath ?" We reply, because it would have been a virtual abandonment of the vital point in dispute ; it would have been giving up to the enemy the key to the whole position. Congress maintained the ground that no insurrectionary State was entitled to representation in either house of the National Legislature, until, as a State, it gave adequate guarantees that it had abandoned the principles of the rebellion, and would henceforth abide by the amended Constitution, the Union, and the obligations of honor and justice contracted by the nation in putting down the rebellion. So long as such guarantees were not given, Congress would have stultified itself in admitting any man, however loyal ; and so Horace Maynard, Senator Fowler, and Col. Stokes, the tried loyalists claiming seats from Tennessee, frankly acknowledged.



in this opinion. We are constrained to believe that Mr. Johnson had already made up his mind not to agree with Congress, except on the condition of its first yielding to him all the vital points in controversy. If there were no other evidence of this, his speeches, and those of his Secretary of State, during their late electioneering tour to the grave of Douglas, leave no doubt on the subject. Whatever may have been thought before, we are at a loss to understand how anybody, after reading these extraordinary effusions, can suppose for a moment that the dilatory action of Congress, or the "white-washing" epithet of Mr. Sumner, or even the sarcasms of that extremely "radical" but sturdy and whole-souled old patriot, Thaddeus Stevens, led Mr. Johnson to abandon the loyal cause. Is it not, alas! too plain that he had deserted it already in his heart; and that these things so offended him, because they helped to betray the fearful secret to the watchful eye of the country?

We are not disposed, therefore, to censure Congress for having delayed so long to decide upon a plan of reconstruction. This delay was highly salutary and needful. The task was one of the most difficult ever assigned to a legislative body. And for three months after Congress met, the country was far from being in the mood to break with the President and stand up in solid phalanx for its loyal Senators and Representatives. Thousands of patriotic and thoughtful citizens, who in July last were in full sympathy with Congress, in December, 1865, or even in February, 1866—at least before the 22d of that month—would have taken sides with the Executive; of this no other proof is needed than the memorable Cooper Institute meeting on the evening of Washington's birthday. So the final rupture came, probably, at the best time; neither too soon nor too late. It came just when public sentiment was ripe for the great issue. Instead of blaming Congress for not sooner agreeing upon a policy, we rather praise it for its wise delay. The policy was thus made far more perfect, and popular opinion was prepared to give it a much heartier and more intelligent support. However desir-

able it might have been to hasten the work of restoration, it was vastly more desirable that the work should be done well than done quickly. It is a thousand times better that the States lately in rebellion should be admitted in the right way one or two years hence, than that they should be admitted at once, or should have been admitted last winter, in a way dangerous to the future peace and safety of the country, or inconsistent with national honor and justice. And it seems to us that the future peace and safety of the Union, and not less the claims of honor and justice, are admirably provided for by the plan of settlement finally adopted by Congress. This plan is contained in a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution. It is as follows :

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION  
OF THE UNITED STATES.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of both Houses concurring), that the following article be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said Legislatures, shall be valid as part of the Constitution, namely :*

ARTICLE XIV.—SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States ; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States, according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of Electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

SEC. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President or Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State Legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States,

shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid and comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

SEC. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection and rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations or claims, shall be held illegal and void.

SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this Article.

This amendment speaks for itself and requires no interpreter. It is well entitled to the place in our American *Magna Charta*, which we trust it will soon occupy beside the great Amendment proposed by the Thirty-Eighth Congress.\* The more it is pondered, the more will it commend itself to the reason and conscience of the Nation as an eminently wise, just, and magnanimous basis for the settlement of the questions arising out of the rebellion. It is, surely, the very embodiment of national leniency and moderation, containing nothing vindictive, nothing harsh, even. Indeed, the only plausible ground of complaint against it is its extreme mildness. Where do the records of history afford another instance of a great and high-spirited nation dealing with a conquered rebellion, which had assailed and almost destroyed its life, on terms so considerate and merciful? Let us for a moment examine these terms. Let us look at this ultimatum of Congressional "Radicalism."

Section 1 defines American citizenship, asserting this high privilege for the 4,000,000 of freedmen, and places it everywhere, without respect of persons, under the benignant and august protection of the National Government. It is nothing else than a practical enforcement of the principles of the Declaration of Independence. When once part of the Constitution, the true measure of the civil rights of every

\* ARTICLE XIII.—SEC. 1.—Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

SEC. 2.—Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

American freeman, whatever his race or color, will be the supreme law of the land—the great law of our Republican Liberty—and not the mere good pleasure of South Carolina, Louisiana, or any other State, whether in the North or South.

Section 2 changes the basis of representation in Congress, and in the Electoral College, in accordance with the results of the war. Without this change the South would actually gain nine or ten members, while the North would lose ten. By this change the three-fifths rule ceases to operate, and the South, instead of gaining ten votes in consequence of rebellion, loses fourteen; so that the practical effect would be a difference of some *thirty-four* votes in Congress and in the Electoral College in favor of the North. And this is perfectly fair and just. The South can at any time turn the balance in its own favor by giving the elective franchise to its colored citizens. But so long as it refuses to do this; so long as it withholds the ballot from these four millions of its population on account of their color, it has no right to vote for them or to claim that it represents them. This section, we repeat, is most just and reasonable, and the North will insist upon it at all hazards. It certainly needs no argument to show that the vote of a late rebel in South Carolina, or Alabama, ought not to equal the vote of two loyal citizens of Maine or Iowa.

Section 3 provides that those who have added perjury to treason, in turning against the Union and adhering to its enemies, the leaders of the rebellion, shall be ineligible to any State or Federal office, until absolved by the people through a two-thirds vote of their Representatives in Congress. And this provision, it will be observed, not only puts a righteous stigma upon perjury and treason in the past, but holds out a solemn warning to all who in the future may be tempted to commit these crimes. Like the section following, it is intended to be a permanent law of the land, looking before and after. How entirely it harmonizes with the views of Mr. Johnson, as expressed in his speech "*defining* (to use his own language) *the grounds on which he accepted*" the Baltimore nomination, and in his various addresses on assuming the Ex-

ecutive reins, it is needless to remark ; although, to be sure, it falls very far short of the large scope and pitiless severity of his doctrine. If any one is disposed to question this statement, let him read the section again and then compare it with the following utterances of the President :

"Treason against the Government is the highest crime that can be committed, and those engaged in it should suffer all its penalties." "They must not only be punished, but their social power must be destroyed." "I say that the traitor has ceased to be a citizen, and in joining the rebellion, has become a public enemy. He forfeited the right to vote with loyal men when he renounced his citizenship, and sought to destroy our Government." "After making treason odious, every Union man should be remunerated out of the pockets of those who have inflicted this great suffering on the country." "Their leaders must feel the power of the Government. Treason must be made odious, and traitors must be punished and impoverished ; their great plantations must be seized, and divided into small farms, and sold to honest, industrious men." "Why all this carnage and devastation ? It was that treason might be put down, and traitors punished. Therefore, I say that traitors should take a back seat in the work of restoration. If there be but five thousand men in Tennessee loyal to the Constitution, loyal to freedom, loyal to justice, these true and faithful men should control the work of reorganization and reformation absolutely."

Section 4 affirms the validity of the National debt, and the illegality of all rebel debts and obligations, or claims for the loss or emancipation of slaves. We regard this section as of immeasurable importance. The repudiation of the rebel debt, it will be remembered, was one of the conditions of restoration laid down by the President himself. But that repudiation, even had it been made part of its new Constitution by every Southern State, would afford no sort of security to the country. It can itself be repudiated the moment the States are re-admitted. Moreover, it says nothing about claims for the loss or emancipation of slaves ; *nor does the Platform of Mr. Johnson's Philadelphia Convention*. Should the South be restored without further conditions, we entertain no doubt that a formidable combination would at once be organized to bring about the assumption of the rebel debt, and the payment of claims for the loss or emancipation of slaves, to say nothing of pensions for the Confederate soldiers. It has ever been to us a matter of unfeigned astonishment that the monied capital of the North, so vitally interested in the public

credit and national securities, should not have shown more alarm on this point. In our opinion the peril from this source can hardly be overestimated; and we see no adequate protection against it, except in an amendment to the Constitution. The South once restored, with a large increase of political power, would be a solid unit in favor of demanding compensation for its slaves, if not the assumption of its war debt; and with the aid of Northern allies hungering for place, who can be sure it would not succeed? Such a combination as we have mentioned, with so immense a prize in view, could well afford to offer a million of dollars, if need be, for a vote; and it is fearful to think what might, yea, what probably would be the effect of such colossal bribery! We should see a "Ring," whose vast magnitude, power, and turpitude, would utterly dwarf and put to shame even that which has so long preyed upon the property and morals of New York.

Section 5 authorizes Congress to enforce the foregoing provisions by appropriate legislation. Brief as it is, this section contains an ample supply of Constitutional power to destroy the last vestige of the rebellion, to maintain the public faith and credit, to protect Southern loyalty, whether of blacks or whites, and in due time to establish impartial freedom, order, and equal justice throughout the Union.

Such is the plan of restoration devised by the patient, far-seeing, and patriotic wisdom of the National Legislature. The Amendment has been ratified already by New Hampshire, Connecticut, Tennessee, New Jersey and Oregon. We cannot doubt that it will be ratified by all the other Northern States, and by a sufficient number of Southern States to make it valid as part of the Constitution. Nor do we doubt that it will confer imperishable honor upon its much-abused and calumniated authors—the faithful, fearless senators and representatives of the Thirty-ninth Congress. Compared with the insane policy of Mr. Johnson, it appears to us as the fine gold of sober, prudent, and high-toned American statesmanship—such statesmanship as sat in council in the renowned convention of 1787.

We are aware that some who acknowledge the Amendment

to be essentially just and reasonable, still deny the right of the National Legislature to make its ratification a condition precedent to the admission of the late rebel States to representation in Congress. They are willing it should be urged upon the acceptance of the South, but only in the way of "moral agitation." This is the ground taken by Rev. Henry Ward Beecher in the deplorable letter which shot such a pang of grief through the hearts of millions of his old friends, and made so jubilant the hearts of millions of his old defamers. It is the ground taken by other honored citizens, whose purity of motive and sincere devotion to their country are unquestionable. But we cannot for a moment admit its validity. We yield nothing to these eminent men in our desire for a speedy and complete restoration of the Union. Nor are we willing to concede that our faith in the New Era, or in the beneficent and reconciling power of American and Christian ideas, is less strong than theirs. But this is not a mere question of "moral agitation;" no more than was that of the adoption of the other great amendment abolishing slavery. Like that, it is pre-eminently a question of wise and practical statesmanship. It concerns not merely desirable things, but things absolutely vital to national honor, security and justice. Such, at least, is the deliberate conviction of myriads of the most thoughtful, sober-minded, and conscientious patriots in the land. Such is the solemn conviction of the overwhelming majority of the men and women, who sustained the country through the war, both at home and in the field. Nor have they the least misgiving as to the constitutional power, or the perfect historical and moral right of the American people, through their senators and representatives in Congress assembled, to require assent to the righteous provisions of the proposed amendment on the part of the late revolted States, as a condition precedent to their sharing again in the National Legislation and Government. No theory denying this power and right appears to them tenable; neither that which asserts the Nation to be pledged to the late rebel States by its public decla-



rations during the war ; \* nor that of the transcendental and impeccable character of the States as States. This last doctrine, especially, as it is preached in support of Mr. Johnson's policy, they find it hard patiently to endure ; the doctrine, we mean, that the Southern States could do no wrong and impair no right, or privilege, by the treason of the people and governments which constituted them States ; that they could not go out of the Union, and never were out, either in law, or in fact ; and that, therefore, they were fully entitled to representation in Congress, not only the instant the war ceased, but *all through the rebellion*—as fully entitled as Massachusetts or Illinois—and that to deny them this representation *until they give to the Nation proper guarantees of the loyalty of the people and governments which constitute them States, as also of its own future peace and safety*—is an act utterly unconstitutional, oppressive, and destructive of the Government.† The over-

---

\* On this point we think many have been misled by the language of the oft-cited resolution on the object of the war, passed by the two houses of Congress in July, 1861, just after the battle of Bull Run. This resolution was a manifesto to the insurgent States, and was intended especially to allay their fears for the institution of Slavery. It embodied, no doubt, the loyal sentiment of the country at the time. But it seems to us that a most inordinate importance has been attached to it. It was passed by a Congress chosen before the war. It was no *law*. It did not bind the Executive, who never signed it, nor did it bind the next Congress chosen in the midst of the war and with exclusive reference to the new issues. When President Lincoln issued his Proclamation of Emancipation, the act was bitterly denounced as a violation of the letter and spirit of this Crittenden resolution ; it was " overthrowing or interfering with the rights and established institutions of those States." But Mr. Lincoln did not consider that he was violating any pledge which bound either him or the Nation. The same charge was brought against the 38th Congress, for proposing the amendment abolishing slavery ; it was an attempt to " overthrow an established institution, and impair the dignity, equality and rights" of the Southern States. But that noble Congress did not admit the charge to be just ; nor did the loyal States who ratified that Great Amendment ; nor did President Johnson, when he required the rebellious States to ratify it also. The Crittenden Resolution had no legal or constitutional force when it was passed ; and it certainly has none now. Still, we see no real inconsistency between a vote for that resolution and a vote for the Constitutional Amendment. The object of the latter is simply to secure the great object of the war as declared by the former, and to fulfill the pledges given by the Nation in its successful prosecution.

† " It seems to us in the exercise of the calmest and most candid judgment we can bring to the subject, that such a claim, so inferred, involves as fatal an overthrow of the authority of the Constitution, and as complete a destruction of the Government and Union, as that which was sought to be effected by the States and people in armed insurrection against them both."—*Address of Mr. Johnson's Philadelphia Convention.*

whelming majority of those who sustained the country through the war, we repeat it, regard this doctrine as a monstrous sophism, repugnant alike to political reason, to fundamental principles of moral and social order, and to sound common sense. And their opinion of it seems to us entirely correct.

No fine-spun metaphysical theory of State rights, or of the Constitution, can serve as a just and proper basis for the settlement of such novel, momentous, and eminently practical questions as have sprung out of the Slaveholders' rebellion. The founders of the Republic never anticipated the occasion for such a settlement; just as little as they anticipated the breaking out, in 1861, of such a stupendous civil war; and they made special provisions for the one as little as for the other. In conducting the war to a successful issue, the Nation was compelled to adapt itself to the unparalleled exigency by creating, both on land and water, its own military precedents; and it has the right to do a like thing in securing the fruits of its incomparable victory. When the Constitution and its own experience cast no sure light upon its "dim and perilous way," it must seek light elsewhere. Following its own Heaven-inspired instincts, and taking counsel at the oracles of Eternal Truth, why should it not create new political precedents in the interest of republican freedom, humanity and justice? Has it not already done so in devising and adopting the great Amendment? Nor have we any fear that such a course will lead it astray from the paths of a wise and genuine conservatism, or of Christian mercy and magnanimity. The loyal heart of the Nation is still disposed, as it has ever been, to the largest possible exercise of mercy and magnanimity towards those lately in arms against its life, that is consistent with the claims of public order, righteousness and good faith. It is afraid to exercise even the blessed quality of mercy at the expense of these sacred principles. And we believe the time is coming when even the South will fully understand this; when she will be willing to acknowledge that the great heart of the Nation, like the heart of its martyred President, was governed in its policy of restoration by no sen-

timent inconsistent "with malice toward none, with charity to all."

We have thus taken a brief view of the political crisis through which the country is passing ; and what we have said might, for the most part, have been written as well before the adjournment of Congress as now. But since that date, public events have occurred of the gravest import, and bearing directly upon our subject. The nation has been in the midst of a severe moral, as well as political crisis. Its patience, its self-command, and its holiest convictions, have been tried and tested as hardly ever before. It has seen the boundless patronage of the Executive prostituted to the work of intimidating and corrupting popular opinion with open and shameless effrontery. Unscrupulous and ambitious, or disappointed, politicians, some of them veterans of half a century in the arts of party intrigue, and whose very names have become odious to the moral sense of the nation, have been seen conspiring together to thwart the righteous will of the people, and to betray the cause of Loyalty and Freedom into the hands of its worst foes. Deeds of savage butchery have been perpetrated at mid-day, in one of the chief cities of the Union, and in the sight of the Flag of our country, which find no parallel this side of the Sepoy massacres in the dark places of Oriental heathendom ; and, to crown the horror, the Chief Magistrate of the Republic stands in such relations to them, both before and after, as to have impelled sober-minded, Christian citizens to turn deliberately to the Constitution and ponder, for the first time, the meaning of those "*OTHER high crimes and misdemeanors*" on impeachment for and conviction of which "THE PRESIDENT . . . SHALL BE REMOVED FROM OFFICE." (ART. II. Sect. 4.)

And, as if this were not enough, the ear of the nation has been assailed, week after week, by denunciations of its Supreme Legislature as a usurping, disunion body "hanging upon the verge of the Government," and by dark threats of a rival Congress to be made up of late rebels and their allies from

"the other end of the line," as also of another civil war, to be carried on—not on Southern—but on Northern soil. Nor have such threats and denunciations been uttered by reckless politicians alone; they have been scattered broadcast over the land, like so many fire-brands, arrows and death, by the lips of the Executive himself! Is it strange that these things have filled the public mind with the deepest excitement and alarm? Is it strange that they have pressed, like an incubus, upon all loyal hearts, keeping thoughtful men and women awake at midnight? Is it strange that, in view of them, the tide of popular sentiment is running with such resistless might in the direction indicated by the Vermont and Maine elections?

It is not our purpose to discuss the New Orleans riot. The end of that dreadful story is not yet. The American people are still reading it; and they require no interpreter and no argument to explain to them its meaning, or to tell them who are the responsible and guilty authors of it. They have studied and compared the President's dispatches and every other dispatch, whether in its mutilated or un mutilated form; they have read Mr. Johnson's apology for the massacre in his speech at St. Louis; they have pondered Gen. Baird's report, and will ponder every word of the Report of the Military Commission when it sees the light. If any further evidence is needed, they will demand that it be taken the moment Congress shall assemble. And we are very much mistaken if they do not also demand in due time, and in a voice not to be trifled with, that in some way the crime should be punished and the matchless infamy of it washed off from the American name. In dismissing the subject, we content ourselves with putting on record a single extract from one of Gen. Sheridan's dispatches to Gen. Grant; simply begging our readers to compare the closing recommendation respecting Mayor Monroe with the dispatch, signed five or six weeks later by that Head Centre of the "Thugs," as still Mayor of New Orleans, lauding the President and his "policy," and supplicating him to return from St. Louis to the seat of Government by way of Louisiana:

"The more information I obtain of the affair of the 30th in this city, the more revolting it becomes. *It was no riot. It was an absolute massacre by the police, which was not excelled in murderous cruelty by that of Fort Pillow. It was a MURDER which the Mayor and Police of the city perpetrated without the shadow of a necessity.*

"Furthermore, *I believe it was premeditated*, and every indication points to this. I recommend the removal of this bad man."

In passing from the New Orleans massacre to the Convention which met in Philadelphia on the 14th of August, we have no thought of casting wanton reproach upon that body. We shall not question that many of its members were actuated by honest and patriotic motives. Some of them are known to the whole country for their high personal worth, their eminence in public service, and their varied attainments; some of them, also, like the accomplished temporary chairman, Gen. Dix, for their honorable record during the war. We have no disposition to speak of such men otherwise than with respect. But the Philadelphia Convention did not originate with such men; they were not its managers; nor is their character any fair exponent of its real intent and purposes. Their aim was very different from the ultimate aim of the Washington and New York politicians, whose old, cunning brains and expert hands contrived and manipulated it; and some of them are, probably, already finding this out. The Convention was imposing in numbers and marked by extraordinary enthusiasm for Mr. Johnson and his "policy," for itself and for the triumphs it was going to win; it seemed to excite no enthusiasm, however, among the loyal and great-hearted people of Philadelphia. Its chief authors evidently thought "the order of exercises" a master-piece of adroit management; the country, on the other hand, was inclined to regard the whole thing, from the "arm-in-arm" farce at the opening to the closing scene in the White House at Washington, as a huge political blunder. What, for example, could be less fitted to win the public confidence and admiration than the frantic manœuvres to keep out Mr. Valandigham, Mr. Fernando Wood, and a Mr. Dean? Our noble Board of Health did not struggle with a more anxious and persistent zeal to keep the Asiatic cholera out of New

York. And yet the entire country knew very well, that if all the members of the Convention, who sympathized with the principles represented so faithfully by these gentlemen, had been required to leave it, the whole concern would have suffered an instant collapse; scarcely a Southern delegate would have remained, and the places of the larger portion of the Northern delegates would also have become vacant. It was beyond measure absurd to imagine that the clear and single eye of the American people could be deceived by such a bungling political trick. And then, what could be more unwise than to convert the Convention from an arena of honest public conference and discussion into a ridiculous dumb-show, by muzzling the lips of all the delegates, except the handful to whom special parts had been assigned? The Address and Resolutions, although posterity will not, probably, consider them quite equal to the immortal work of the Convention of 1787, or even as a "Second Declaration of Independence," (President Johnson to the contrary notwithstanding), are yet written with skill and ability, as was to be expected from their author; and in spite of much fatal error and sophistry, they assert also many most important truths; but was it exactly kind and "magnanimous" to require the delegates from the late rebel confederacy to give their solemn assent and applause to doctrines, statements and pledges, which their hearts, if not their consciences, must have utterly refused to endorse? \* Was not this imposing "degrading conditions upon our Southern brethren?" So it was regarded by the leading organs of public opinion at the South; and accordingly, with a

---

\* As e. g. the following Resolutions of the Platform :

8. "While we regard as utterly invalid and never to be assumed, or made of binding force, any obligation incurred or undertaken in making war against the United States, we hold the debt of the Nation to be sacred and inviolable, and we proclaim our purpose in discharging this, as in performing all other National obligations, to maintain unimpaired and unimpeached the honor and the faith of the Republic.

9. "It is the duty of the National Government to recognize the services of the Federal soldiers and sailors in the contest just closed by meeting promptly all their just and rightful claims for the services they have rendered the Nation, and by extending to those of them who have survived, and to the widows and orphans of those who have fallen, most generous and considerate care."

promptitude and frankness that did honor to their manhood, they repudiated with disdain the action of their delegates in committing the Southern people to such a creed and such sentiments. Had we space, it would be easy to cite pages of the most explicit testimony to this effect. Still, in spite of all these things, it must be admitted that the Philadelphia Convention was planned with no little skill, availed itself of every advantage thrown in its way by the cross-currents of public opinion, and for a time appeared to those, who looked merely at the surface, as not unlikely to succeed. But there were insuperable obstacles in the way of its success, and sagacious observers saw it to be so from the outset. It was essentially a movement in utter hostility to the loyal cause—an attempt to gratify personal ambitions and revenges by precipitating the process of National restoration on principles in direct conflict with the very ideas which had led the country in triumph through the war; and instead of being deceived, the people at a glance saw through the whole scheme, and were only kindled by it to fiery indignation. That is the rock upon which the Johnson-Seward movement was doomed to be wrecked and go to pieces. And this catastrophe was hastened and rendered doubly sure, by the light which the New Orleans murders cast upon the baleful tendency of the Executive policy; as also by the startling revelation which the stumping pilgrimage to the grave of Douglas afforded of the political temper and discretion of its authors.

Of this melancholy, we had almost said hideous, spectacle upon which the nation was compelled to gaze for two long weeks, we shall allow ourselves to say but very little; it pains us deeply to have to say a word. But silence in this case would be disloyalty to the Christian character of the country, and to the moral dignity and honor of the Presidential office. Government is ordained of God; and if those who are entrusted with its exalted and awful functions by the free suffrage of their fellow-citizens, publicly descend from their high position to the level of the vulgar wrangler, the incendiary demagogue, the boastful and railing egotist, or the clown



and postprandial jester, they merit and should receive the sternest rebuke ; for they desecrate a divine institution, as well as bring disgrace upon the cause of republican liberty. The American people have never before been called to bow the head so low in shame and sorrow for the conduct of their Chief Magistrate ; we trust they will never be called to do it again. One such humiliation ought to be enough for all time. It is a sad thing to say, that the most charitable construction which can be put upon the conduct and language of both actors in this shocking exhibition, is to suppose them not to have been always sober, or in their right mind. How otherwise *could* they so forget themselves, or attribute such political and moral idiocy to the Christian people of the North, as to have ventured to address them in such a style ; still more to expect, by such language, to change their honest and profound convictions respecting great questions of public duty and policy ? We lament beyond measure the effect of this evil example in arousing the angry passions and intensifying the bitterness of party strife. Is it not one office of our Chief Magistrate and Ministers of State to illustrate by word as well as deed, in the presence of the people as well as in the cabinet, the dignity, self-possession, moderation, and high-toned courtesy, which belong to the idea of a Christian Republic ? And we cannot be sufficiently thankful that in the midst of even the repulsive scenes upon which we have animadverted, there appeared—most unwillingly, we doubt not—two illustrious servants of the country—its greatest soldier and its greatest sailor—who well fulfilled this grand office. How expressive the very silence of Grant and Farragut, in contrast with the miserable noise and confusion that surrounded them !

We have written these things with heartfelt regret and sorrow ; for they concern men who have heretofore rendered eminent services to their country, and to the cause of liberty. We gladly leave a subject so ungrateful, and pass on to say a word of the other Philadelphia Convention, which met on the 3d of September.

The records of this remarkable gathering are before the country, and we need not go into details respecting it. The Northern people listened eagerly to its voice, have calmly pondered its statements, and will, in due time, make their own response to its pathetic and manly appeal. It was an assemblage as impressive as it was unique in American history. Its story sounded like a chapter from the old martyrologies of Christian faith and liberty, while its addresses and resolutions carried one back to the Declaration of Independence, and the "times that tried men's souls." How different in all respects from the Confederate portion of the Convention that preceded it! That was largely composed of Southerners, who had done their utmost to tear to tatters the Flag of our Country; this, of Southerners who had suffered shame and loss for their unfaltering allegiance to that glorious flag. The one represented chiefly the old slave-holding aristocracy and wealth of the South; the other represented its poor, plain people, its "mean whites," and its four millions of negroes. The former uttered what had been prepared for it by the calculating politicians who called and "run" it, and was allowed to utter nothing else; the latter was, at all events, a council of unmuzzled freemen, each speaking what was in his heart. The one deemed it a great achievement to have kept out Mr. Vallandigham and Mr. Fernando Wood; the other had a colored man among its delegates, was proud to welcome Frederick Douglas to its floor, and listened with delight to his manly and powerful eloquence. Andrew Johnson had the unbounded admiration of the one, ABRAHAM LINCOLN seemed to be enshrined in the grateful love and veneration of the other; and while the former adjourned to meet again in the White House, and there offer incense to its idol, the latter adjourned to meet again around the grave where repose the mortal remains of our martyred President. There was not in all the South a man still cherishing the spirit of the rebellion, who did not rejoice greatly in the August Convention, how much soever he may have scorned the thought of being bound by its pledges, or of assenting to its doctrines; nor was there in all the South such a man, who did not regard

the September Convention with mingled contempt, hatred and fear. Are all these strange contrasts accidental? or do they not rather express deep affinities, and fundamental principles of political right and wrong?

There was only one point of serious difference among the members of the September Convention, viz., the question of impartial or negro suffrage; and even on that point the difference related rather to the time and mode than to the principle itself. Most of the delegates from the border States were unwilling to assert the principle at once, and put it into the platform; while most of the delegates from the "unreconstructed States" were not only ready to assert the principle and put it into the platform, but they maintained that their political salvation and that of the whole South which they represented—the Union men during the war, the poor whites, and the colored population—absolutely depended upon its bold assertion and early realization. And certainly no candid person can read their argument and statements in support of this opinion, without feeling their overwhelming force. Without approving of everything that was said, we believe the effect of the Convention will be to enlighten the public mind on this momentous question, to remove prejudice, and so to hasten the day when the mere color of his skin shall debar no American citizen from the right and privilege of the ballot-box. That day is sure to come. The logic of our democratic institutions, the inexorable logic of events, and the calm reason and justice of the nation will combine to bring it to pass without fail. And why should anybody be afraid of that day? Even President Johnson fully acknowledges the principle and the wisdom of putting it in practice, in his dispatch to Provisional Governor Sharkey, of Mississippi, dated August 15, 1865, in which, referring to the State Convention, he says: "If you could extend the elective franchise to all persons of color who can read the Constitution of the United States in English, and write their names, and to all persons of color who own real estate valued at not less than two hundred and fifty dollars, and pay taxes thereon, you would completely disarm the adversary

and set an example the other States will follow. *This you can do with perfect safety.*" And if it could be done in Mississippi "with perfect safety" in August, 1865, when the war was hardly over, it certainly could be done now "with perfect safety" in every Southern State, and (alas! that it needs to be added) in every Northern State which is still enthralled to the cruel prejudices begotten of slavery and *caste*.

Let this question of impartial suffrage and the political rights of the colored citizen be settled in accordance with the fundamental principles of American society; and then—the Constitutional Amendment having been adopted, and enforced by appropriate legislation—we cannot doubt that peace and prosperity would soon prevail throughout all our borders, and that all classes and conditions and races of men among us would rejoice together in the blessings of a new era of Christian light and liberty. In the enjoyment of such blessings the bitter memories of the war would gradually fade away, the antipathies and rivalries of North and South would cease, and the whole nation, revering the merciful hand of God in the past, even in the bloody conflicts of the battle-field, would march forward on the line of its great destiny with exultant hope, trusting still to the guidance of that merciful and almighty Hand. A consummation so devoutly to be wished will not, indeed, come of mere legislation, however wise and beneficent; all the agencies of Christian faith and philanthropy, untiring prayers, every form of pious labor and self-sacrifice, the pulpit, the press, the church, the school, innumerable men, women and children even, who love Christ and His cause, must be added to complete and crown the glorious work. These heaven-born agencies are already busy with their part of the divine task. Let Christian patriotism and statesmanship do their part also, both at the ballot-box and in the council chamber; let political and religious wisdom and zeal thus conspire together; and who can refuse to believe that God, even our fathers' God, will be merciful unto us, and bless us, and make His face to shine upon us, as never before; or that the end thereof will be peace and assurance forever? Then shall come to pass in this great Re-

public the prophetic words, written thousands of years ago among the hills of Palestine : In righteousness shalt thou be established ; thou shalt be far from oppression ; for thou shalt not fear ; and from terror, for it shall not come near thee. Thou shalt know that I, the Lord, am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob. For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron. I will also make thine officers peace and thine exactors righteousness ; violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting and destruction within thy borders ; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise.

---

ART. VI.—DIVINE REVELATION.

Translated from the German of Dr. Richard Rothe, by J. W. NEVIN, D. D.,  
Lancaster, Pa.

THAT no theory of the Holy Scriptures can be constructed without a positively settled conception, in the first place, of *Revelation*, and that bibliology, consequently, must begin its work here, may be considered as at present, beyond question. With our older Protestant theology, indeed, it was otherwise. The thought of a divine revelation was for its view covered almost entirely by that of the Bible ; they were treated as at once identical. Even after theologians had begun to distinguish them, the distinction was maintained only in the abstract ; concretely, they were still blended together as before. The Bible was for them now, it is true, only the *revelatio divina mediata* ; but this alone had any interest for them, and that between it and revelation proper, there could be anything more than a mere formal difference, entered not into their thought. Proceeding always from the notion that divine revelation consists in the supernatural communication of religious doctrine to men, they thought of it at once as holding in the divine gift of the Holy Scriptures, from which we now draw this doctrine. For under the *revelatio divina immediata*

or *primitiva*, was comprehended to their mind simply the illumination originally imparted to the prophets and apostles by the Holy Ghost, and this they made to be that the Holy Ghost "*prophetis et apostolis conceptus rerum et verborum de dogmatibus fidei et moribus suggessit.*" Aside from this view of the supernatural origin of the Holy Scriptures, these older theologians show no clear, distinct apprehension whatever, of what we are to understand by divine revelation. And just here it is that the new theology of our time has taken up its work. The accomplishment of a complete distinction between divine revelation and the Bible, is one of the weightiest among the enduring acquisitions for which we owe it our thanks.

The old theology, too, it is true, had much to make of the conception of divine revelation in its own way; but all under another aspect, agreeably to its notion of religion as having its principle or first starting point in knowledge. The problem for it in this view was not, how revelation stands relative to the Bible, but this rather, how the religious knowledge which is imparted to us by revelation, stands related to what we may know without it. With regard to this it brought out to good purpose the distinction between natural and supernatural religion, and was especially successful in setting forth the relation of reason to revelation; cutting up by the roots the wretched confusion we still meet with on the subject, by insisting on the thought that the reason of man is only on the way here to full actualization, and that we have no right to confound it in such view with our common empirical consciousness and thinking. This needs regeneration, not only that it may be purified, but also that it may be raised to higher quality and tone. Reason is, indeed, a great thing, if only we had it in actual possession! But there, alas, is the difficulty. Rationality is our common human endowment, but it has never come to complete actualization in us except in one only case. The power of thinking is not itself the fact of absolutely right thinking; just as little as the power of will is the fact of freedom or of willing rightly. The old theology thus had no quarrel necessarily with rationalism, so far as this kept itself to

the proper sense of its own name ; it held revelation to be above and beyond reason as men have it now, in only relative and defective form, but in full harmony with it, at the same time in its absolute character. With all this, however, it must be confessed, that the subject labored under much confusion. There was a want of power with the theology in question to master practically here the details of its own general thesis. The ground of this may easily be understood. It lay in the lame conception of revelation, strictly so called, with which the system had to help itself. Religion being supposed wrongly to start in the form of knowledge, divine revelation was thought of almost exclusively as the communication of complete doctrinal statements for the understanding, and this, moreover, in an immediate inward manner by mechanical infusion. Such a conception necessarily involves the whole subject in embarrassment. Human reason is thrust aside by it altogether ; revelation is shorn of its natural life ; the view of the world from the standpoint of religious faith becomes supernatural, narrow, stiff, and pedantic. In one word, a divine revelation, *thus* apprehended, is no longer compatible with an actual human history.

Such a revelation, however, bears no resemblance to the true and actual one which is offered to our view through the Bible. This is exhibited to us as a series (continuously connected) of extraordinary *historical facts* and *institutions*, to which are joined there with specific practical application, the supernatural illumination of prophets in various ways, as visions, and as interior converse with the Spirit of God, not so much for the communication of new religious doctrine, as in order to point the way beforehand to other coming historical events.

We may assume now as universally acknowledged, what has been so convincingly brought into view by Nitzsch, that God's work of *revelation* is only a particular form of his work of *redemption*, that in which redemption necessarily begins, and which looks to this throughout as its whole object and scope. Revelation, from the beginning, not only heralds the



advent of redemption, but makes room for it as a historical possibility. We may assume farther, that the essence of divine revelation consists in a supernaturally God-wrought purification, as well as invigoration of the sense of God in man, (God-consciousness) which by reason of sin (both individual and general) he is no longer able, from the outward and inward date of mere nature, to exercise in a right and sure way. This does not imply that such revelation embraces all that God has done, or is still doing, toward the work of human redemption. On the contrary, his agency in this direction must be considered as extending from the beginning to the history of the race in all its parts. Only so much we affirm, that this universal divine pedagogy has looked in particular to the restoration of a true sense of God (renovated God-consciousness) within the range exclusively of the covenant religion, and consequently has only here attained to the character of *revelation*. All history confirms this. For much as the life of the nations holding mythical sway have contributed to social and political culture, it is notorious that to *religious* culture, the clearing and vivifying of the sense of God, it has, in fact, contributed nothing whatever.

Revelation looks, then, to the purifying and strengthening of the sense of God in man. To this, and to this alone; so much we asseverate, on the threshold of our inquiry. Revelation is, by its very conception, God-revelation; God, in revealing, reveals *Himself*; God, and God only, is the object which the divine revelation reveals, God and nothing else. What of new knowledge it brings us, is exclusively the knowledge of God; as regards other objects, much as we may desire it, it gives us no information whatever. That is directly. Indirectly it sheds its illumination over the whole world. For by bringing forth the sun of a true sense, or consciousness of God in our firmament, it irradiates the entire sphere of our existence with the full light of day, so that we may see and know all things different from what they must appear to our otherwise relatively benighted view. But this right knowledge of things again is not put as it were ready made into

our hands ; the objects of it are only set in the clear light of day, where they may be rightly perceived and observed ; while the task of observation and study is still thrown upon ourselves, and is carried forward here with toilsome difficulty, through many errors and mistakes, and with what must be counted as in the end but partial and fragmentary success at the best. God leads us by his revelation into *all* truth ; not so, however, as to promulgate for us supernaturally an all-embracing system of knowledge, but by causing his own true *image* to shine forth above our horizon, as the day-spring from on high, in whose beams we may learn to comprehend all things. Revelation is not a science of astronomy for men ; but a disclosing of the starry heavens to their view, from which they may form a science of astronomy for themselves.

But now comes the question, how God works this cleansing and strengthening of the God-consciousness in man ? and it is here especially that the old notion of revelation needs radical amendment. It makes the relation between man and God in the case, to be altogether mechanical ; which is precisely what we need above all things to guard against in our construction of the doctrine. According to the old view, God reveals to man *without any co-operation* on man's part. God infuses his revelation into the human soul ; which in the reception of it is purely passive ; God working upon it by an outward act simply of his own omnipotence, and mirroring into its consciousness magically a complex of images which are for it not only new, but positively foreign and strange. Were this actually the case, the revelation could not be said to come really to the man, much less into him ; it could not be his property. For into our personal life, by an unalterable law of our being, nothing can enter, which is not brought to pass by our own co-operation and in union with our own freedom. What is to be ours in this way must come to us through the medium of our intelligence and will. As a singly outward process moreover, in the view stated, revelation must preclude all development of the religious consciousness in man, for which indeed there would be in such case no occasion or

need. If there is at all, then, a revealing agency of God, an agency of God by which he opens himself to human consciousness, it can never be *magical*; it must be conceived of necessarily as mediated for man, that is, as involving the intervention of the personal functions of man, and as being conditioned by the working of these as a co-operating factor in all that is brought to pass. In one word, divine revelation, supernatural though it be in the fullest sense of the term, is not conceivable except as mediated through human thinking. Only so can it correspond with the nature of man; only so can it correspond with the form in which revealed religion is presented to us in the Bible. This is characteristically distinguished from all other religions, in being essentially *moral* or free in its constitution, in being the result (mediately) of personal action on the part of man. It passes *through* the free intelligence of man, and is thus brought to pass by it as the proper product of his personality. This it is emphatically, which makes it to be truly human and truly spiritual, in one word, the only true religion, in full diametrical opposition to the magical character of all heathen religions; for in the world of spirit, the magical precisely is the non-personal, or what comes not through the intervention of man's spiritual nature.

If then the sense of God in man, what we call his natural God-consciousness, darkened and weakened as it has come to be through sin, is to be purified and strengthened (the immediate object of all divine revelation) it must be in a way conformable to the laws of his personal or human life. In other words, the proposed new quality of this consciousness must be the result of an operation on the part of God that works *through the powers of the human soul itself acting in a natural way*. In this view, what is proposed cannot be reached by a direct act, breaking in upon the moral constitution of the soul in an abrupt, magical manner; the end must be reached circuitously, as it were, by an agency that approaches the man first on the outside, so as to set his interior life in action as from within itself, in a way answerable strictly to its standing psychological organization.

our hands ; the objects of it are only set in the clear light of day, where they may be rightly perceived and observed ; while the task of observation and study is still thrown upon ourselves, and is carried forward here with toilsome difficulty, through many errors and mistakes, and with what must be counted as in the end but partial and fragmentary success at the best. God leads us by his revelation into *all* truth ; not so, however, as to promulgate for us supernaturally an all-embracing system of knowledge, but by causing his own true *image* to shine forth above our horizon, as the day-spring from on high, in whose beams we may learn to comprehend all things. Revelation is not a science of astronomy for men ; but a disclosing of the starry heavens to their view, from which they may form a science of astronomy for themselves.

But now comes the question, how God works this cleansing and strengthening of the God-consciousness in man ? and it is here especially that the old notion of revelation needs radical amendment. It makes the relation between man and God in the case, to be altogether mechanical ; which is precisely what we need above all things to guard against in our construction of the doctrine. According to the old view, God reveals to man *without any co-operation* on man's part. God infuses his revelation into the human soul ; which in the reception of it is purely passive ; God working upon it by an outward act simply of his own omnipotence, and mirroring into its consciousness magically a complex of images which are for it not only new, but positively foreign and strange. Were this actually the case, the revelation could not be said to come really to the man, much less into him ; it could not be his property. For into our personal life, by an unalterable law of our being, nothing can enter, which is not brought to pass by our own co-operation and in union with our own freedom. What is to be ours in this way must come to us through the medium of our intelligence and will. As a singly outward process moreover, in the view stated, revelation must preclude all development of the religious consciousness in man, for which indeed there would be in such case no occasion or

need. If there is at all, then, a revealing agency of God, an agency of God by which he opens himself to human consciousness, it can never be *magical*; it must be conceived of necessarily as mediated for man, that is, as involving the intervention of the personal functions of man, and as being conditioned by the working of these as a co-operating factor in all that is brought to pass. In one word, divine revelation, supernatural though it be in the fullest sense of the term, is not conceivable except as mediated through human thinking. Only so can it correspond with the nature of man; only so can it correspond with the form in which revealed religion is presented to us in the Bible. This is characteristically distinguished from all other religions, in being essentially *moral* or free in its constitution, in being the result (mediately) of personal action on the part of man. It passes *through* the free intelligence of man, and is thus brought to pass by it as the proper product of his personality. This it is emphatically, which makes it to be truly human and truly spiritual, in one word, the only true religion, in full diametrical opposition to the magical character of all heathen religions; for in the world of spirit, the magical precisely is the non-personal, or what comes not through the intervention of man's spiritual nature.

If then the sense of God in man, what we call his natural God-consciousness, darkened and weakened as it has come to be through sin, is to be purified and strengthened (the immediate object of all divine revelation) it must be in a way conformable to the laws of his personal or human life. In other words, the proposed new quality of this consciousness must be the result of an operation on the part of God that works *through the powers of the human soul itself acting in a natural way*. In this view, what is proposed cannot be reached by a direct act, breaking in upon the moral constitution of the soul in an abrupt, magical manner; the end must be reached circuitously, as it were, by an agency that approaches the man first on the outside, so as to set his interior life in action as from within itself, in a way answerable strictly to its standing psychological organization.

This outside movement must present itself in a form transcending the established order of things in the natural world. The facts of the natural world proclaim the existence of God; but they are not sufficient to rouse the human soul, (torpid through sin) to a proper susceptibility for the apprehension of his presence and glory as thus made known. They need therefore to be *reinforced*, we may say, by new phenomena, in such manner that they may be fitted to reflect the idea of God into the soul with full truth and sure evidence. Divine revelation begins then in the exhibition of such new outward data; which, as transcending the ordinary course of nature, are of course supernatural or strictly miraculous. These phenomena, whether as events in nature or events in history, are made to offer themselves within the horizon of human observation, under a character and form that make it possible for the right idea of God to be derived from them with clear evidence in full conformity with the established laws of the soul. For this purpose they must be so constituted, that they can be explained only through the idea of God, as being plainly not referable to any causality in the world, but in the fullest sense supernatural; and then they must image the idea of God truly and correctly. This requires that they should appear under both the characters already noted in conjunction; in other words, that they should be at once events in nature and events in history. For the imaging of a *right* idea of God in the human consciousness demands first of all a just view of what we call his character, embracing particularly his moral attributes; but these can be exhibited only in the form of divine action directed toward some end, which as such can have place in history alone, and never in nature simply as such. Then again, however, there can be no history otherwise than on the ground or basis of nature, and consequently a miraculous working of God in history must involve his miraculous working also in nature. The object before us can be reached thus only through both forms of outward operation; in such sort, however, that the events in nature shall be subordinated to the events in history, and this theologically (the first in

order to the second), according to the relation of nature to history in general. What we have to postulate here, then, is a supernatural history including expressly events in nature. Supernatural history, we say ; not just single supernatural occurrences in history. For what is of historical nature is ever part of a consecutive movement, and never an isolated occurrence ; and it is only through their practical concatenation indeed, that facts can at all become historical, and the exponents in particular of moral motives and personal character.

This is the first side of revelation. God intervenes, with supernatural, clearly evident, historical self-demonstration (working personally from a higher sphere than that of our common human life) in the natural course of history, in such a way as to force his presence on the sin-clouded human sense, engaging its attention, awakening its consideration, and so making room for its coming to a right apprehension of his character. Examples of such divine intervention abound in the Old Testament. For distinction's sake, we will call what has thus been described the *Manifestation* of God.

The conception of divine revelation, however, is only half met by what is thus presented to our view. To this outward objective side of the case must be joined, as its necessary complement, an inward, subjective side, which we will call *Inspiration*. If the outward manifestation is to reach its proposed end, it must be understood, and understood rightly. Without this it would be only a passing meteor, that could not enter with any real, abiding effect into the course of history, as the idea of the world's redemption requires. The awakening of the God-consciousness in man depends not simply upon the strength of the impression made upon him, which might be provided for by the manifestation alone, but also upon the right character of the impression. God, in his revelation, seeks to make evident, not only that he is, but also who he is ; the first, indeed, not being possible in full without the last, since every wrong apprehension here leads necessarily to some doubt in regard to the reality of its object. Can sinful man, however, in himself considered, rightly understand the mani-



festation of God when offered to his view? The Christian must deny this on the ground of his own religious experience; and the nature of the case also shows it to be impossible. The personality of man in general, and with this in particular, the organ of knowledge in him, his knowing faculty, has been corrupted through sin, and his diseased eye is not able to take in anything correctly, and so of course, then, not the divine manifestation as we have it now under notice. If this is to be *rightly* understood, therefore, God must accompany his outward exhibition of himself with an inward and so far *immediate* influence upon the consciousness of him to whom the revelation is addressed, by which this shall take right direction in regard to it, and so be led into the right and true knowledge of God, according to the measure of the particular manifestation. The case calls for inward enlightening from God, the direct producing of knowledge in man for the right understanding of what is exhibited in the form of outward supernatural fact; and this, as we have said, we call inspiration. It is an influence immediately from God upon the action of the soul, which yet is not magical; for by the nature of the case it is conditioned by the peculiar religious sensibility to which the soul has been roused in view of the divine manifestation, according to natural psychological law; an inward state, which of itself makes it peculiarly susceptible for such inworking of God, and which, moreover, unavoidably binds it to the one express purpose of decyphering the sense of the mysterious supernatural occasion immediately before it. God inspires, as Nietzsche says well, through his manifestation. This, as it is the occasion of the inspiration, governs it also with absolute control. The inspiration has for its sole end the intelligible solution of what is contained in the manifestation. They go hand in hand together, and cannot fall asunder; each requiring the other as its natural and necessary complement. The manifestation without the inspiration would be a dumb portent; the inspiration without the manifestation, a fantastic *ignis fatuus*. They authenticate each other, by their mutual, complete correspondence. The true conception of revelation involves both

in indissoluble union, the manifestation as its outward and objective side, the inspiration as its inward and subjective.

Inspiration assumes different forms, according as the supernatural knowledge it imparts is procured either under individual, or under universal character, is matter of feeling, or matter of thought, according as the person inspired is either seer or prophet. In the first case, it completes itself as vision. In the second case, God touches the keys of the human soul in such wise that, out of the general mass of its thoughts and conceptions, some are so brought together as to originate in the consciousness an essentially new thought, which the man knows he has not himself produced, has not brought to pass genetically through any voluntary management of his own thinking, although he may be able afterwards to think it over again, and thus preserve what he has found. We have a very distinct analogy with this in all so called genial conception. There is, as we say, an inspiration of genius, in which the ordinary workings of the mind are transcended altogether by apperceptions that seem to flow in upon it from a higher world. Something of this sort, indeed, all superior minds recognize, as having place, more or less, in their best thoughts. They can understand Fr. Perthes, when he confesses that "a great deal more had come to him in his life suddenly, without effort of his own, than all he had ever been able to acquire by reflection and study." There are bright, rare moments, as Baader tells us, in which a truth bursts like a new star upon our spiritual vision, strange and yet familiar; our own and yet not our own, but, as it were, a heavenly presence brought into us from abroad, kindling our whole existence suddenly into the light and glow of unwonted life. To such moments, he adds, we owe all that is true, and great, and beautiful, in the world of human thought and action. There is a divinity within us that brings all to pass, independently of our ordinary, self-wrought efforts; our province in the case is simply to give utterance to its inspiration, to echo forth its mysterious sense. In this, however, we are active organs, and not blind instruments merely; the force that moves us is, after all, not

impulsion from without, but impulsion from within. The inspiration which is upon us brings with it at the same time the greatest freedom in the use of our own powers. There is an analogy, we say, between such genial or poetical experience as we meet with it in our common life (the soul especially of all æsthetic or creative art), and divine inspiration in its proper theological sense; and it is possible to make use of the fact plausibly against the whole idea of a strictly supernatural afflatus of God's Spirit in this way. Schleiermacher, we know, lays great stress on the difficulty of distinguishing clearly between specific revelation and what the soul is thus inspired to apprehend in a natural manner. But this difficulty holds in truth, only when divine inspiration is thought of as being by itself alone the entire fact of revelation, without any regard to the connection in which it always stands necessarily with a given divine manifestation. This, as we have seen, rules and controls the case throughout. The true theopneusty, of which we now speak, differs at once from all analogous experiences, just by the fact that it is bound expressly to such objective manifestation both causally and teleologically; that is, in such a way that this is the occasion of it historically, and at the same time furnishes the whole problem whose sense it is required to solve.

Both manifestation and inspiration, as we have seen, are historically conditioned. This implies historical limitation or circumscription; and this, again, a gradual development or growth in the divine revelation. It takes its course historically through a series of progressive stages. For God must accommodate the supernatural facts with which he makes himself known, in every case, to the conditions of intelligence that are at hand in the sphere to which he addresses himself; he cannot put forward historical data that must be unintelligible in such sphere, through want of the necessary prerequisites for their being understood. And so as regards inspiration, the other side of the process; it can take place only so far as it finds in the person inspired the single elements, through whose immediate combination by God's Spirit those thoughts are

called forth which constitute the proper understanding of the manifestation. Yet it is not necessary that this understanding should be at once commensurate at all points with what is contained in the manifestation; right as far it goes, it may still be incomplete. For the manifestation is intended to enter as an abiding fact within the horizon of humanity, by means of historical tradition; in which case, if only there be a right beginning with the understanding of it, the way may be opened in course of time, even through its own historical effects, for the evolution more and more of the conditions required for understanding also what was still incomprehensible in it at the first; and in this view, therefore, it need not be planned exclusively for the first moment of its occurrence, but may be adjusted at the same time to the whole course of things flowing from it afterwards in the way of history. Thus we find it to have been ordered actually in the conduct of divine revelation, as we are made acquainted with it in the Bible. The inspiration of the Old Testament prophets, while it set forth rightly the sense of God's manifestations as far as it went, is still represented to us (Comp. Pet. i. 10-12) as not coming up to it at all in full. Only where revelation becomes fully complete, as we have it in our Lord Jesus Christ, is all room for any disproportion of this sort brought wholly to an end.

In Christ, as the God-man, manifestation and inspiration are absolutely coincident, each being in itself absolutely complete. As he is the full manifestation of God, so is this fully open at once also to his consciousness and knowledge; his inspiration is one with himself. In this view it becomes more than mere inspiration; it is the fullness of the Godhead dwelling in him bodily, real oneness with God. In both respects he stands alone, and embodies in himself singly the whole New Testament revelation. He alone, in his person and life, constitutes the entire manifestation by which God here makes himself known; and he is the *complete* manifestation of God just by this, that in him one individual human life in the rounded unity of all its parts, mirrors forth the divine presence. Answerably to this, he alone understands also what is comprehended in his per-

son. His inspiration in this view, involving as it does identity with God dwelling in him, is altogether his own. He makes God known to the world by making himself known. For the New Testament revelation, there is beyond him no inspiration adequate to interpret authentically the divine manifestation here—which is Christ himself. The inspiration of the apostles themselves was not sufficient for this. They stood above all others in their specific relation to Christ; but even they could not take into themselves the full meaning of his person; they were able to understand and interpret him approximately only, in the measure of their ability severally to reproduce and report faithfully his own testimony concerning himself.

As now described, revelation is plainly *supernatural*; that is, it is not the product singly of powers belonging to the natural order of the world. This does not mean, however, that it has nothing to do with the order of nature, for just the reverse of this must always be strenuously maintained; but it is to be considered supernatural, inasmuch as it comes of the natural order only so far as this is wrought upon by a causality which transcends all its own proper forces and powers, and which is thus shown to be immediately divine. In such view, it involves no contradiction in our idea of revelation that it is found to require also with equal necessity on the other hand, the predicate *natural*. So much is implied at once by the fact of its entering the world in the form of history, for historical and natural are kindred terms; what is comprehended in history must be comprehended at the same time in the real life of the world, as a course of events joined together in a natural way. But revelation is more than mere matter of history in this general view; it aims also to become an active, universal force in history, laying hold of the movement, and seeking to carry all in its own direction and course. But thus to create history, it must, beyond all question, take nature upon itself, and be inwardly joined to it in its own sphere of existence. Only in this way can it lay hold of the world, become at home in it, enter as a power of real development

into its life, and master fully its historical factors and forces, so as to transfuse into them, as Twisten says, its own substance. Such being the case, it follows that nothing can authenticate itself as revelation which appears in the midst of history under a solitary abstract character ; which is not comprehended organically in the great historical movement of divine revelation regarded as a whole. Natural and supernatural show themselves inwardly blended together in fact, through the whole world of revelation, as it is presented to our view in the Bible ; and with this corresponds in full the nature of the idea itself, as it has now been the subject of our consideration. It must be both supernatural and natural, at once from beyond the world, and yet at the same time from within the world, in order that it may be either a possibility or a reality.

Here especially our older theology is found to be sorely at fault. In laying stress on the supernatural character of revelation, it fell into the error of making it unnatural, a sort of Gnostic phantom playing itself off in the midst of nature, without ever coming to any real union with it in fact ; a sort of visionary presence in the world, claiming to belong to it, and yet holding itself aloof from it, always in the nimbus of an unearthly existence exclusively its own. The theology in question had no sense whatever, we may say, for the now familiar and generally accepted view, according to which revelation is regarded as being historical and divinely dramatic, a progressive movement on the part of God in the organism of human history, designed to make itself felt as an efficient force in the universal life of the world. What was thought of always in the case, was only the new light which divine revelation was imagined to bring with it immediately in its primary organs and witnesses, the knowledge that was supposed to be infused into these directly by God's Spirit ; this being taken for the whole process, which reduced itself thus to a mere abstract inspiration, without the needful basis of an outward objective manifestation. The main object of revelation, however, is not simply the lighting up of new truths in this way

in the mind of a prophet; it is rather to bring the objective facts in which it starts (illuminated by progressive inspiration) within the range of permanent human vision, so that they may come to be part and parcel of the world's abiding consciousness through all subsequent time, God manifests himself in certain grand demonstrations of his presence, evidently transcending the whole order of nature, and bringing into view some new element of his being, some previously unknown side of his character; these stand forth as single events or data in history, and have at once their startling significance; but they are designed for far more than any such momentary effect. Their full signification is for gradual, progressive apprehension; and for this purpose they must take their place as fixed lights in the firmament of human consciousness, that they may be continually in sight, and thus work their meaning more and more into the world's general life. In this way revelation enters as a co-efficient into the whole process of human knowledge and culture, beyond the range itself of its perceived and acknowledged presence. It shines upon the world, and makes itself felt historically in its moral constitution, even where the world owns it not, and sees not in it any revelation whatever.

---

#### ART. VII.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

##### GERMANY.

The recent war in Germany has kept back the publication of works of a real solid class in philosophy and theology; but it has given the professors more leisure for pursuing their investigations, while it has not sensibly interfered with the university lectures. At Berlin, Semisch takes the place of Niedner, and has begun his lectures under encouraging auspices. Twisten, though advanced in years, is still as fresh and genial as ever; his work on Dogmatics will probably have to be completed from his Lectures. Hengstenberg contends as valiantly as ever against the enemies of church and state (according to his theories of the nature and relations of the two). Dörner is just completing the residue of the last sheets of his History of Protestant Theology, to be published in the new Encyclopædia projected at Munich. His course on Dogmatics at the university deservedly attracts a large audience; it is very thoroughly elaborated. In philosophy there is but little to be noted. The Hegelian periodical, *Der Gedanke*, is discontinued. Its editor, Professor Michelet, has just published two volumes on Ethics (*Das Natur-*



recht) written in the sense of the Extreme Hegelian school; politically he favors the institutions of the United States. This work is also intended in part as an offset to Prof. Trendelenburg's volume on the same subject. The latter is still lecturing with his accustomed clearness and force.

At Halle, Julius Müller is still able to continue his lectures, though he speaks with more constraint than formerly. This summer he has been lecturing on the Gospel of John and on Practical Theology; on the latter subject he recommends the work of Nitzsch as the most important. Dr. Tholuck, too, in spite of constant bodily ailments, is unremitting in his duties at the University; he has not failed in a single lecture for thirty years, though he has not, during all this time, known what it was to be entirely well. He is lecturing on the Corinthians, and on Ethics. Riehm, who has been recently added to the corps of editors of the *Studien und Kritiken*, is attracting large classes to his lectures on the Old Testament. The sudden death of Hupfeld is a great loss to the University. His library of about 8,000 volumes is offered for sale; it is very full in all that pertains to the oriental languages.

Leipsick has now a strong theological Faculty, embracing the names of Kalnis, Tischendorf, Lechler, Luthardt and Brückner. Tischendorf lectures only once a week; but he is hard at work on his new edition of the Greek New Testament. He is to edit the Codex Vaticanus—a great honor for a Protestant, attained by his undeniable preëminence in this department. He has also just completed a new and enlarged edition of his little work on the time when the Four Gospels were written, which has had such great and deserved success. In the Preface, he speaks out boldly and plainly about the negative criticism. Kalnis is an admirable lecturer—clear, sharp, and decided. The flurry occasioned by the publication of the first volume of his Dogmatics has subsided. The second volume of his Dogmatics is a condensed and pregnant History of Doctrines. Luthardt is also an able lecturer, and gaining steadily in influence. In philosophy, Drobisch defends Herbart's system, while Weisse maintains his independent position.

The new edition (partly posthumous) of Niedner's Church History (one vol.) is about two-thirds re-written: the rest is taken chiefly from sheets which were printed for the use of Niedner's students.

Jacobi has nearly ready for the press the second volume of his Compendium of Church History. The printing of the German edition of the second volume of Dr. Schaff's Church History, is going on in Germany simultaneously with the printing of the English edition in New York.

A new edition, 3 vols., the translation of Dante by King John of Saxony (Philaethes) has just been brought out in good style. This translation is considered the best in the German language; the notes show marks of extensive and exact rendition, even on theological subjects. King John, though somewhat shorn of his political significance by the recent Prussian successes, and though he is the Roman Catholic ruler of a Protestant people, is universally beloved and esteemed. His attainments in philology, the sciences, and theology, are very remarkable. He takes the deepest interest in the Saxon University of Leipsick, and fosters all its departments as liberally as possible.

Weberweg's History of Philosophy is regarded in Germany as the best compendium on that subject; two volumes, on the ancient and mediæval systems, have appeared, and the third is promised soon.

The *German Quarterly for English Theological Investigations and Criticisms*, edited by Dr. Heidenheim, and published by Perthes at Gotha

contains many valuable papers, and notices of both English and German works. It is published at irregular intervals. In the fifth part, Dr. Keim gives an account of an ancient Christian legend, which throws some light upon the Diocletian persecutions, showing that they began earlier than is generally assumed. H. Grossley discusses the locality of Mt. Sinai; O. Stehlin, in a paper entitled Comparative and Productive Systematizing in Theology, discourses chiefly on Christ's Estate of Humiliation. Other essays are Dr. A. Müller on the Ahasuerus of Esther; Dr. F. Müller on the Armenian MSS. in Vienna; Dr. Heidenheim on a Codex of the Prophets in the British Museum, and a translation of a remarkable Dream of the Priest Abischa, "a Samaritan Prophet." In parts six and seven, we have translations from Dean Stanley's Oriental Church; Mural of St. Petersburg, on the Firkowitsch collection of Hebrew MSS. in St. Petersburg—the largest in Europe, and the Sinaitic Codex; a translation by Dr. Heidenheim of Ab Gelugal's Prayer from the Samaritan liturgy, with the text; an account of Abu l' Fatal's Samaritan Chronicle with the Arabic text, by R. Payne Smith; translations of Syriac Hymns, with the text, by Dr. Zingerle; the Epistle of Jude, from the Vatican Ms., a fac simile, by Dr. Heidenheim, here published for the first time; an essay by the same, on the Synagoga Magna of 70 (120) Elders; and criticisms on the works of Colenso, Wordsworth, Pusey, Stanley, Davidson and others. The eighth part, dated Dec. 28, 1865, contains an essay by E. Graf, on Titus Silvanus (Acts xv. 22); Heidenheim on the text of Proverbs, the Litany of Markas, with the Coptic text, etc.; R. Payne Smith on the Samaritan Chronicle, with the Syriac text, and criticism of books, among which Dr. Thomson's, *The Land and the Book*, is well spoken of.

The Firkowitsch collection of MSS. spoken of above is very remarkable; it was made in the Crimea, where Caraitie Jews have been settled for many centuries. Prof. Chowlson says that all other libraries do not contain a tenth part of the literature here collected in 272 Caraitie MSS., besides 523 Rabbinical works and 250 other writings. The MSS. of the Hebrew Bible elsewhere found, do not reach beyond the 10th century; the Firkowitsch collection has 47 Synagogue rolls of the Pentateuch, dated 489, 639, 764, 781, 789, 798, 805, 847, 909, 920, 939, besides 77 other codices and 23 versions. A notice in one of these says, that in 957, the Jews in the Crimea first received the vowels and consonants from Jerusalem. Several MSS. from Persia show a different system of vocalism and accentuation. The 272 Caraitie Mss. also elucidate, more fully than before the history of the Jews from the sixth to the tenth century; the Caraites were the Protestants of Judaism.

*Zeitschrift f. d. historische Theologie.* Part II. 1866. This periodical has passed, since Niedner's death, into the hands of Dr. Kahnis of Leipzig, who will probably give to it a new impulse. The first article, by Dr. Goldhorn, is an elaborate examination of the question respecting a work ascribed to Abelard *De Unitate et Trinitate*, and its relation to Abelard's works, entitled *Introductio* and *Theologia Christiana*. Dr. Goldhorn's conclusions, in which he deviates from current views (e. g. Cousin and Jourdain, in their edition of Abelard, 2 vols. Paris, 1849-59) are, that the *Theologia*, now called *Introductio*, was written in the last part of Abelard's life; and that the treatise entitled *Theologia Christiana* is an older work, which made the basis of the above *Introductio*, and is probably the same as the work *De Unitate et Trinitate*, for which Abelard was condemned at Soissons A. D. 1121. The second article, by Hachfeld, gives for the first time in print, the *Swabian Confession* of 1574, which

preceded and was the basis of the *Formula Concordiæ*; it is a valuable addition to symbolical literature. The third article, by Dr. Henke, gives extracts from the Letters of Balthasar Schuppianus, a sharp satirist and earnest Christian, in the first half of the 17th century, the Spenser of his times, whose memory has, within a few years, been revived by the biographical sketches of Vial (1857), and Oelze (1862).

*Zeitschrift f. Wissenschaftliche Theologie.* 1866. Erstes Heft. The editor, Prof. A. Hilgenfeld, opens the number with an essay on Christianity and Modern Culture, to show the need of their reconciliation, referring especially to recent speculations of Rothe and Strauss. The character of the reconciliation which he advocates, may be inferred from the fact, that he thinks that even Strauss's positions may be included in the compact. Hilgenfeld also defends anew his position, that the Gospel of Mark comes properly between Matthew and Luke. He compares the present opinions about Mark to the three views about Universalism in the middle ages: viz., *Universalism antea*, in rebus, and *post rebus*: so some hold that Mark is *before* Matthew and Luke, others *after*, and others between (in). Lipsius continues his investigations upon the Shepherd of Hermas and Montanism in Rome. The other articles are short and chiefly controversial.

The number of the theological students in the Prussian Protestant Universities, 1865-6, winter semester, was 1,008 (18 more than in 1865); the Catholics number 667 (48 more than in 1865). All the students numbered 6,077, with 559 Professors and teachers.

A table of German publications for the year 1864, shows this result: In theology, 1,411 books; belles-lettres, 935; jurisprudence, 870; education, 696; history, 671; natural history, 517; medicine, 491; classics, 402; art, 385; mechanics, 359, etc.

*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie.* 1866. First Part, vol. XI. Rösch on the Year of the Birth of Jesus—he puts it with Scaliger at the end of February or the beginning of March in the year 2 before our era. Dr. Planck of Göttingen, contributes an able essay on the Gods, and the Belief in Gods of the Ancient Germans, after Tacitus' *Germania*. Cropp on the Monastic Life in its Religious and Ethical Motives. Palmer, the Peculiar Character of the Evangelical Theology in Würtemberg. Laurent on the Epistle to Philemon; holding (1) that it was sent to Laodicea, but is not the Epistle to the Laodiceans; and (2) that the Epistle to the Ephesians was also first sent to Laodicea.

*Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie.* 2. 1866. Klostermann, Homiletic Interpretation of Phil. ii. 5-13. David Frick, The Religious movement in the Ecclesiastical district of Kautokeino in Finland. C. R. von Bahder, The Universal Priesthood of Christians in its Relation to the Ministerial Office. Karl Heyder, The Relation of Göthe to Spinoza.

An important work in reference to the history of the Reformation in Spain and the doings of the Spanish Inquisition has been written by Dr. C. A. Wilkins, pastor of the Reformed Church in Vienna, on the Life, Writings and Fate of Fray Luis de Leon. Luis published on Job, 1580, the Canticles, 1572, *Les Nombres de Christo*, 1583, etc.

*Studien und Kritiken.* 3. 1866. Steitz, The New Testament View of the Power of the Keys: Diestel, The Bible and Natural Science in the Period of Orthodoxy; Matthias, The Olive Tree in Romans; Marcker on Gal. ii. 6; Weiss on Schleiermacher's Life of Jesus; Gaab, Jung-Stilling and his Times.

*Bibliotheca Historica.*—Under this title, Mr. Brockhaus, of Leipzig, has recently issued a voluminous catalogue, compiled only as Germans know

how. It is entitled "Verzeichniss einer Sammlung von Werken aus dem gebiete der Geschichte und deren. Hülfswissenschaften Vorräthig auf dem lager von F. A. Brockhaus' sortiment und Antiquarian in Leipzig;" and is one of the most complete historical catalogues ever issued. It is arranged under countries, with numerous sub-divisions. Thus of England, we first have General History, then Early History, followed by that of James I. to Charles II., James II., and William III.; then from George I. downwards. The next divisions are Geography and Travels, and lastly, Scotland and Ireland. The collection of works relating to Germany is, as may be expected, very large, but that of such countries as South America and Australia is really surprising. It contains nearly 400 pages, and enumerates no fewer than 8,663 different works—all with prices.—*The Bookseller.*

#### FRANCE.

A new volume of Madame Swetchine's Letters has just been published, edited by the Count de Falloux. Her journals and letters are in some respects the most remarkable of any recently published in the Catholic literature of France. They breathe a spirit of deep Christian faith and love, and a firm trust in God's providence and grace. She died in 1857. During her long residence in Paris (her husband was a Russian General) she was in constant intercourse with the leading literary, as well as theological writers. The best French critics, as Sainte Beuve, assign her a very high rank as a thinker and writer.

The Committee of the French Society of Emancipation has addressed letters to the Queen of Spain, and to the Emperor of Brazil, urging these monarchs to abolish slavery in their dominions. These appeals are subscribed by such names as the Duke and the Prince de Broglie, Guizot, Count Montalembert, Laboulaye, Cochín, Henri, Martin, De Pressensé, and others. The one addressed to the Emperor of Brazil begins with a reference to our own example: "At the moment that the Republic of the United States, victorious in a long and deadly war, has given liberty to four millions of slaves, at the moment when Spain seems about ready to yield to the voice of humanity, and of justice, we venture to address to your Majesty an ardent appeal in behalf of the slaves of your empire."

The Commentaries on Exodus and Leviticus, by Prof. Alexander de Mestral, published at Lausanne, in 1864-5, are favorably noticed in the *Archives du Christianisme*. Though popular and practical they show an acquaintance with the best recent exegetical works of Germany; the style is vigorous and clear.

The second part of Guizot's apologetic work is entitled *Meditations on the present state of Christianity*. It has been received with much favor, and is exerting a good influence, in opposition to Renan and other writers of the negative school. Renan's volume on the *Apostles* is generally regarded as altogether inferior to his former work; it has not even produced a momentary "sensation." His criticism is so negligent and arbitrary that it carries no conviction with it. In scientific value it is far below the German works that traverse the same field.

The second and third volumes of Laboulaye's History of the United States have just appeared. The second contains the history of the Revolution; the third is devoted to an account of the formation, and an exposition of the principles, of our Constitution. The work is made up of the lectures which the author has been delivering for several years, and which were so numerous attended and so highly applauded. It contains a defense of our republican institutions, with allusions to the coun-

ter European systems. It appears, too, at a time when the public is better prepared to hear the truth about us than ever before. The author is a firm friend of our country, and has of late been specially gratified by the tribute sent him from the New York Fair for the Sanitary Commission, consisting of a superb album, filled with the portraits of American statesmen, generals, and scientific and literary persons.

The second edition of Michel Nicolas' *Religious Doctrines of the Jews* has just appeared, with a new preface, in which the author speaks of the relations of the doctrines of Jesus to the antecedent Jewish system. His theory is, that the teachings of Christ are but the completion and the higher form of Judaism; and that in the second century Christianity was essentially modified by Greek and oriental elements.

*Bulletin Théologique*, 1864, 1865. This valuable supplement to the *Revue Chrétienne*, containing theological essays, has hitherto been published quarterly, but it will henceforth be published every two months. In the numbers for 1864 and 1865 are the following articles: C. Malan, on the Divine Authority of the Bible, and on the Life of the Human Soul or the Life of Faith. Hugenholtz, on Conscience in its religious relations, two articles. E. de Pressensé, on Theological movements in France, in 1863 and 1864; on the Origin of the Synoptists, and on Philo and the Essenes—the last article is extracted from his forthcoming *Life of Jesus*. F. Litehenberger, an account of the Theological Literature in Germany, 1863, 1864. Bleek, on the Gospel of John, translated. Tischendorf, *When were our Gospels written?* translated. F. Bonifas, *The Humanity of Jesus Christ*, as represented by John. Th. Rivier, *The Day of the Death of Jesus*. Ch. Byse, a Review of Nicolas' Critical Studies on the Old and New Testaments. R. Hollard, on Schleiermacher's Life of Jesus. R. Ashton, on English Theology. E. Arnaud, on Human Nature according to St. Paul, etc., defending the division into body, soul, and spirit. F. Godet, Prof. in Neuchâtel, on the Modern Interpretation of the Apocalypse—contending that the reference of the number 666 to Nero is incorrect. L. Thomas, an interesting criticism of the divisions in the *Theological Encyclopedia*, proposing the following schemes: 1. Apologetics; 2. Historical Theology—Bible and Church History, etc.; 3. Systematic Theology, including Dogmatics, Ethics, Polemics, and Speculative Theology; 4. Practical Theology.

*Le Recensement de Quiriniûs en Judée*, par Henri Lutteroth. Paris, 1865. pp. 134. To relieve the difficulty about the taxing under Cyrenius (Luke ii. 2), M. Lutteroth proposes to put i. 80 to ii. 5 in a paragraph by itself, to make "the shewing to Israel" (i. 80), to mean a first presentation of the child, according to Jewish custom, at Jerusalem, about his 12th year, and that to coincide with the time of the taxing (in ii. 2); and so to translate ii. 6, or to make it refer to a previous period to which the evangelist then goes back, viz. "There, too, they were, at the time, when," etc. This way of meeting the chronological difficulty is certainly ingenious and novel. Other chapters discuss the chronology of the Gospels in the light of this interpretation; the Roman taxings under Augustus; and the part ascribed by Tertullian to Sentius Saturninus in the enrollment in Judæa.

M. Viennet, one of the Academicians, and ninety years of age, is about to publish a History of the Papacy, from the time of Innocent III. on which he is said to have been at work for fifty years. It was printed six years ago, but laid aside. The Pope's Encyclical against Freemasonry has led to its publication, the author being Grand Master of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry in France.

. *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*. Jan.—March, 1866. Sauley's Journey to the Holy Land; Bonnetty, the Religion of the Romans in relation to the Jews, continued; Jules Oppert on Aryanism; Renan's Aegyptology; Judge Grivicar on Fenelon's *Maximes des Saint*; Bonnetty on Marco Polo; Tanglor's History of Mount Athos, with Plates, etc.

#### HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.

Professor I. H. Scholten, of Leyden, has published a work on the Gospel of John, written in the sense of the latest German negative criticism. He puts the time of its composition at about A. D. 140. Scholten is the author of the most comprehensive Dutch work on systematic theology of this century; but its positions are adverse to those of the Reformed Confessions.

Bernhard ter Haar, Professor of Theology at Utrecht, has published ten lectures against Renan's Life of Jesus, which have also been translated into German.

S. F. W. Rooda Von Eysinga, the Self Revelation of God in the Human Spirit. 8vo. Leyden.

The Tyler Theological Society of Haarlem offer a prize of 400 guilders for the best essay on the Essenes, and the same amount for the best critical estimate of Baur's works.

The Hague Society has given to Dr. H. Viskemann a prize for the best work upon Slavery. It is published at Leydon.

The *Nord* of Brussels says: "The appearance of the *Catholique* has been the signal, or rather the manifestation, of a great schism in the clerical party. This new and fiery organ of absolute Ultramontanism has accused the greater part of the journals of the Right, and a vast number of Catholics, of betraying their cause in admitting a sort of tacit compromise between the present age and the prescriptions of the Papal Bull published a few months back."

The Hague Society for the Defense of the Faith has assigned the following subjects for prizes: The Punishment of Death; Dualism and Monism, in relation to Man's Body and Soul; the Permanent Worth of Christianity; the Omnipresence of God, in relation to the Conflict between the Transcendence and the Immanence of God.

#### ITALY.

The most remarkable and complete work that has yet appeared on the Catacombs of Rome is that of the Chevalier Jean Baptiste de Rossi, the first volume of which (price 64½ francs) has been published at Rome, by order of Pius IX., under the title, *Rome Souterraine et Chrétienne*. It gives a complete account of the history and exploration of those remains of primitive Christianity, and it is hailed by the Roman Catholics as an ally to their cause.

According to the report of Baron Natoli, Minister of Education, there are in Italy 52 seminaries for the education of priests; 208 mixed schools, under control of the priesthood, with 13,000 scholars; 279 lycæums and gymnasia under the supervision of the State. The government is insisting upon a suspension of the 208 mixed schools. The Report contains a severe criticism upon their present management and course of study. Under the old system, out of a population of 22,000,000 about 17,000,000 were said to be illiterate. There are now in the kingdom 1,910 priests who are professors or schoolmasters; in the 19 universities 241 of the professors are priests. The total income of the churches has been 68,529,422 francs, of which the bishops and canons received 36,912,722



frances, the monasteries and nunneries 16,216,552. The income of parish priests has been about 500 francs; the government has paid a subsidy to them of 2,226,431 francs. A new bill reduces the incomes of archbishops, and bishops, and canons. There are 219 bishoprics in Italy.

It is said that the "Emancipation Society" in Southern Italy has formed 24 auxiliaries for the several Italian provinces. Its members at present consist of 971 priests, 852 laymen, and 340 honorary members; 1823 persons in all. Among the 971 priests are 102 *cures*, and 40 high dignitaries of the Church. Among the laymen are three ex-Ministers of the Kingdom of Italy, 36 deputies, and 11 senators. Among their objects are: To bring about an oecumenical council for the reform of the Catholic Church; Liturgy in the national language, and free circulation of the Bible; abolition of forced celibacy; admission of full and entire liberty of conscience.

#### SCANDINAVIA.

G. L. Plitt gives an account of the Latest Swedish Translation of the New Testament in the fourth part of the *Journal for Lutheran Theology*, 1865. The first version was made by the Chancellor Lorenz Anderson, in 1526, on the basis of Lutter's German version. Archbishop Lorenz Peterson improved this, and also, aided by Gustavas Vasa, in 1541, published the Old Testament. This is called the Gustavian version, in honor of the King. He also published an improved version of the New Testament in 1550. There the matter stood, until, in 1773, a Royal Commission was appointed to revise the whole. Specimens of these versions were issued from 1776 to 1793; but it was rather a paraphrase than a translation, and the style was too much modernized. Bishop Tingstadius tried to amend this in his edition of 1816. A new commission was named in 1841; it published specimens in 1853, and in 1861 the whole New Testament, at Upsala. An account of their principles and proceedings is given in a work of A. E. Knös, *Am Revision of Scenska Bibelförfärsättningen*, etc., pp. 113, Upsala, 1861. The old version is made the basis. The results of modern criticisms of the text are prudently used.

The University of Christiania, Norway, was founded by Frederick VI., in 1811. It now has 45 professors and teachers, and about 500 students.

Mr. Thompson, keeper of the Royal Museums of Copenhagen, is deceased. He wrote largely on archaeological subjects, and was the founder of the Scandinavian Archaeological Society.

The *Journal of Sacred Literature* for April contains an account of Protestantism in Scandinavia, from a Roman Catholic writer, chiefly devoted to the philosophy of Prof. C. J. Boström, of Upsala, who published *Theory of Government*, 1859; an account of his system. 1859; *Remarks on the Doctrine of Hell*, 1864, 2d ed., etc. He has been opposed by Prof. O. F. Myrberg, Dean Beckman, and others. He is accused of denying the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, and of advocating an absolute idealism in philosophy. He has been Professor at Upsala since 1840. Prof. Myrberg is editor of a journal, *The Witness* (Vittnet), devoted to the defense of Christianity. It has been published since 1864.

*Sechzehn erzählende Dichtungen von A. Petöfi*. Aus dem Ungarischen übersetzt von K. M. Kertbeny. Prag: Steinhäuser. London, Williams & Norgate. Alexander Petöfi is one of the most extraordinary examples of what it is in the power of genius to effect. He was the son of a butcher, and, which was worse, of an impoverished butcher. His early days were sufficiently unpromising; he would learn nothing at school, and ran away to become successively an errand-boy, a soldier, an unsuc-



cessful actor, and a vagabond. But he had contrived to pick up one or two modern languages, and already felt himself a poet. Receiving some encouragement from a newspaper, he set out to walk from Debreczin to Pesth in the middle of winter, with three shillings in his pocket, his manuscripts between his skin and his shirt, and a huge cudgel in his hand. Arrived, he introduced himself to the reigning poet, Vörösmarty, who listened with exemplary patience while the wild-looking young man declaimed his verses, and, when he had finished, calmly observed, "You are the only lyrical poet that Hungary has ever had, myself not excepted. We must take care of you"—an incident which Petöfi's biographer is probably quite correct in pronouncing unique in literary history. From that hour Petöfi's fortune was made; his intellect, his attainments, his poetical faculty developed with astounding rapidity, and his productiveness surpassed everything—at least on the part of a real poet—that the world had seen since the days of Shelley and Byron. He became a journalist and politician, espoused the popular cause with all the vehemence of his nature, and, when the civil war broke out, served as aide-de-camp to Bem, by whom he was highly esteemed. At the battle of Schässburg, where Bem himself only escaped by plunging into a bog, Petöfi disappeared altogether. No doubt exists that he was killed, but the body was never found, and literally no trace of him remained except the poems which have eclipsed the past and revolutionized the future of Hungarian literature. The secret of this extraordinary success lay chiefly in the intensely national character of Petöfi's poetry. The nation had had many good poets before him, but, as Vörösmarty perhaps intended to imply, they were not *Hungarian* poets in anything but their language. They had formed themselves on foreign models, and a nation inferior to none in spirit and self-respect felt a secret humiliation at being solely represented by them. Petöfi did not, then, enrich a previously existing literature; he called a new one into life, and achieved in his own department the same independence for his countrymen which it is their darling aim to realize in politics. This will sufficiently account for their enthusiastic appreciation of his writings, which, with every allowance for the imperfections of translation, must still appear somewhat extravagant in the eyes of dispassionate foreigners. Much of his poetry resembles the inferior productions of Byron—energetic in expression, but poor in feeling and commonplace in thought. Often, again, he is like Burns; and here, indeed, he stands on his own ground, and appears to have been to Hungary what the Ayrshire ploughman was to Scotland. He will be indebted for much of his European renown to the translator of this volume, though unfortunately M. Kerthey wants the *curiosa felicitas*, the vivifying touch which makes all the difference between poetry and prose.—*Saturday Review*.

#### SWITZERLAND.

A. L. Herminjard has collected and published (Geneva, 1866) the first volume of an important work, *Correspondence of the Reformers in the French-speaking Countries*. It is to be published in ten annual volumes; the first is devoted to the years 1512-1516. These letters have been collected with great diligence, and will add materially to our knowledge of the Reformation.

Two large chests have recently been found in the neighborhood of Geneva, containing the sermons and correspondence of the younger Turretive (John Alphonso) from 1690 to 1740. There are letters from all parts of Europe.

There are now in Geneva 4,000 French refugees, and many Italians, many of them fugitives from debts and justice. There are also 5,000 Germans there. The conservative-liberal party still maintains its ground, though the radical Fazy is very active. Ernest Nairlle's lectures on Ethics are thronged. M. Conlin is the most popular preacher, drawing 4 to 5,000 to St. Peter's Cathedral.

#### ENGLAND.

*The British and Foreign Evangelical Review.* No. LVI. April, 1866. The Ecumenical Councils, by Dr. P. Schaff, of New York. Kurtz and A. Stewart on Sacrifices. The Church and the French Revolution, on the basis of De Pressensé's work. Political Economy and the Christian Ministry. Horace Mann. Literature of the Sabbath Question. Geology; its Progress and Limits as a Science. Archbishop Snesen—the Danish theologian of the 13th century. The Sensational Philosophy—a review of Mill by Calderwood.

*The British Quarterly Review*, April. Anglicanism and Romanism—on Pusey, Manning, etc. Praed and his works. Bradshaw. Club Life in London. Peter the Great. The Reformed Church of France—an excellent account of its present state. The Rinderpest of Great Britain.

*The Journal of Sacred Literature.* April. Mill and the Inductive Origin of First Principles. The Site of Sodom and Gomorrah. The Historical Character of the Gospels, by Rev. C. A. Row. Scripture on the Intermediate State. Eusebius of Cæsarea or the Star, in the Syriac Text, by Dr. Wm. Wright. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. Protestantism in Scandinavia. Inspiration and Revelation. Correspondence. Reviews, etc.

The ratio of the supply of ministers to the Church of England is decreasing in proportion to the population. The population of England and Wales increases 240,000 per annum. This would require 200 clergy; the vacancies by death (about 25 to 1,000) are 442 per year. In 1865 there were 539 deacons ordained, 103 less than are needed. The population of England and Wales is 20,209,671; the whole number of clergy is 17,667. In the London Diocese there is one clergyman to 3,590; in Manchester Diocese, one to 2,794; in Hereford 1 to 458. From 1834 to 1843, 5,350 deacons were ordained; from 1844 to 1853, 6,656; from 1854 to 1863, only 6,009. The number ordained in 1855 was 120 below the average from 1844 to 1853.

*Liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters.* London: Nutt. A translation of the Syriac poems of Ephraem Syrus is one of the most valuable contributions recently made to the history of the early Church. Much cannot indeed be said for the poetical spirit of these compositions, which, with every allowance for the imperfections of translation, must be pronounced cumbersome and tedious; didactic, homilistic, controversial, anything rather than poetical. They are, however, most valuable as illustrations of primeval doctrines and practices, and more particularly as showing the general atmosphere of feeling and opinion which prevailed in the author's time among Oriental Christians. The most spirited and interesting are the hortatory and deprecatory hymns composed while the city of Nisibis, where the author lived, was besieged by the Persians. From various allusions, aided by the narrative, of Ammianus Marcellinus, we can almost follow the progress of the campaign from one day to another, and the picture of the prevalent alarm is lively in the extreme. Other pieces deplore the obstinate heathenism of the neighboring city of Carthæ; others are levelled at Arians and other nonconformists of the pe-

riod. The date of all these pieces can be determined with tolerable certainty, but this is not the case with the numerous and singular poems on Death, many of which are couched in the form of a dialogue between Death and the Devil. The execution is grotesque, but the conception suggests curious reminiscences of Milton. The editor's prolegomena and annotations are models of brevity and clearness. Being apparently a Roman Catholic, he keeps a watchful eye upon his author, and is always at hand to explain away anything savoring of heresy. It is almost superfluous to add that this treasure has been derived from the unrivaled Syriac collections of the British Museum, and that the editor acknowledges himself greatly indebted to the custodian, Dr. Wright.

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The *Literary Churchman*, London, in a notice of Kirk's Charles the Bold, which it highly praises, says: "America has produced almost a school of historical writers, who, just as England is falling away from her ancient ideas of the dignity of history and making Clio speak like a housemaid or a comic actress, have treated her with all her wonted majesty, and bring her forward in all her unforced dignity of simplicity and truth, as knowing well what grave events that passed among the mighty dead deserve to be spoken of seriously." It finds in Kirk's work "only one Americanism," viz.: using *unloosen* in the sense of *loosen*, and not of *bind*. But the critic is here mistaken. Johnson gives this sense, though he says it is barbarous, as "the particle prefixed implies negation." But here Johnson too is wrong, for the word is from the Anglo-Saxon *unlesan*, as *loose* is from *lesan*, and the prefix *un* is merely intensive. (See Worcester's Dictionary.)

The *Historical Magazine* says that "Joseph L. Chester, Esq., now residing at London, England, has been making a complete copy of the Matriculation Registers of Oxford University, from 1564 to 1750, permission having been afforded him. It will consist of more than one hundred thousand entries—name, parentage, residence, age, etc., and will be invaluable, as such a list never will be printed. He has already identified members of the early New-England families, and, among other things, has settled the ancestry of the famous Anne Hutchinson.

Dr. J. Austin Allibone has at last completed his "Critical Dictionary of English Literature," and the second volume will soon be placad before the public. The *Philadelphia Press* gives some statistics about this valuable work. It was projected in 1850, and the author commenced preparing it for the press in 1853. The first volume (A to J), of over 1,000 pages imperial octavo, was published in December, 1858. The manuscript of the whole work, fairly copied for the press, fills 19,044 large foolscap pages. Twenty-two months were required to write up the letter S, and about as many more for the letter W. The catalogue of authors includes 700 Smiths, 90 of whom are Johns. Altogether, there are 30,000 biographical and literary notices, and there are 40 indexes of subjects. The entire mass of manuscript was copied by Mrs. Allibone.

*The History of Bernard du Guesclin and his Epoch*, by Mr. Jamieson of S. C., which was finished at Charleston in the midst of our late conflict, has had the unusual honor of being translated and published in Paris, by order of the French Minister of War, Marshal Randon. It is edited by M. Baissac, who make corrections in some points of detail, and adds maps *e. g.* of the battles of Poitiers and Pontvalain. The

French critics speak of its "vast erudition," and of "the impartiality of the author's, military and political judgments."

Dr. Walker, of Cambridge, has prepared a memoir of President Quincy, at the request of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

Dr. Happer, a missionary of the (O. S.) Presbyterian Church in China, has translated the Westminster Confession into the Chinese; it is in the press.

Rev. S. R. Brown, American Missionary in Japan, has completed the translation of Matthew's Gospel in Japanese.

Dr. Adger is preparing for the press several volumes of the works of the late Dr. Thornwell.

#### MEXICO AND SOUTH AMERICA.

Manual de Odriozola, Historical Documents of Peru in its Colonial Epoch to its Independence; 3 vols. Lima, 1863-64, J. Bautista Valeri, The Divinity of Jesus Christ; an analytic Refutation of the Life of Jesus, by Renan, pp. 310. Lima. 1864.

D. Francisco Pimentel's Descriptive and Comparative View of the Indigenous Languages of Mexico, published at Mexico, 1862, is the most important and able work on that subject. The author is said to be a man of rare learning. The Mexican Geographical Society appointed a commission on this work, and gave to it a prize. Its price is about \$5.

The Empress Carlotta has written a pamphlet on "Mexico from a Provisional Point of View."

Dr. Andres Bullo died at Santiago, Oct. 15. He was one of the most celebrated of Chilean authors. His works are upon legislation, philosophy, philology, and the natural sciences.

J. M. Pereira da Sitra Historia da Fundacao do Imperio Brasileiro. Tomo i.-iv. Paris.

The Protestant congregations are increasing in South America, from the German emigration and other sources. In Brazil, at Santa Isabel, are 413 evangelical Christians; in Rio de Janeiro, 3,000; in Santo Pedro, 1,200; in New Freiburg, 1,000; in Donna Francisco, 1,200. In Rio Grande do Sul province, are said to be 250,000 Protestants not provided with religious services. Under Dr. Borchard, in the Sao Leopoldo province, there are 2,000; in Monte Video, is a congregation of 200; in Uruguay, 660 Waldenses; in Buenos Ayres, there are 3,000. In the La Plata States are also many Germans.—*Neue Evang. Kirchenzeitung*.

#### ART. VIII.—NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

*Discourses on Redemption as Revealed at "Sundry Times and in Divers Manners,"* designed both as Biblical Expositions for the People, and Hints to Theological Students. By REV. STUART ROBINSON. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1866. Dr. Robinson has made himself notorious during our civil strife for his disloyalty. His attacks upon the North, and upon the action of the General Assembly (O. S.) sustaining the North, have been persistent and rancorous. He was also the chief offender in the matter of the Louisville Presbytery, which occupied so much of the time of that Assembly at its last meeting. Exiled from the country he fulminated his thunders from the neighboring province of Canada, where (at Toronto) he delivered these discourses.

Still, we would not use these facts to the prejudice of this volume, which bears internal evidence of having been prepared in peaceful times, and embodies the results of real scholarship and patient labor. The au-

thor has given no little time and attention to this form of Bible teaching, and has succeeded in it in a remarkable degree. He has chosen such topics for discussion, and so arranged the volume as to secure a logical development of the gospel in the order of its communication.

The Introductory discourses are on The Diversity in Unity of Revelation, and on The Inspiration of the Scriptures. The main part of the work is divided into six sections, viz.: Redemption as revealed in the Theophanies—Redemption as revealed through the Spirit of Christ in the Prophets—as taught by Jesus the Incarnate Word—as preached by the Apostles under the dispensation of the Spirit—and as proclaimed by Jesus the Ascended. Each section is subdivided, and the topics appropriate to it are discussed in separate discourses, numbering some twenty in all. In the Appendix the author discusses several topics related to the discourses, especially The Place of the Church in the Scheme of Redemption, the Ordinances of Public Worship, and its Relation to the Civil Government, more elaborately and fully than was allowable in the limits of a discourse.

The execution of the work is able and learned. The cardinal doctrines of the Christian system are set forth with clearness of statement, and defended with vigor of thought and logic. The author is familiar with the current phases of error and unbelief, and deals them some heavy blows. The volume abounds with apt illustrations and striking appeals. We commend it especially to theological students, and the younger portion of the ministry, as a suggestive and useful work.

*History of Julius Caesar.* Vol. II. The War in Gaul. New York: Harper & Brother. 1866. We have space for little more than the announcement of the second volume of this imperial history. The literary and mechanical execution of the present volume is in all respects equal to that of the former. While the recent war in Europe has lessened somewhat the eagerness of the public to know the personal views of Napoleon and stript him of much of his former political significance, still, in a literary point of view, this history deserves and will command unusual attention, and its completion will be looked for with interest. In this volume the author traces the career of the eminent Roman from his appointment to the government of Gaul to the crossing of the Rubicon, —a very important period of his life.

*Homes Without Hands.* Being a description of animals classed according to their principle of construction. By Rev. J. G. Wood. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. This work on natural history by an English author, already favorably known, embodies a fund of information, both interesting and valuable, to the general as well as the scientific reader.

The arrangement of the author is strictly scientific. He describes 1. Those animals that burrow in the ground, being the simplest and most natural form of habitation. 2. Those that suspend their homes in the air. 3. Those that construct their domicils of mud, stones, sticks, etc. 4. Those that make their homes beneath the surface of the water. 5. Those that live socially in communities. 6. Those that are parasitic upon animals or plants. 7. Those that build on branches.

The author gives the fruits of extensive and pains-taking scientific research; and much of it is curious and wonderful. The illustrations are numerous and of a very superior character. Such works as this and the "Harmonies of Nature, or the Unity of Creation," by Dr. Hartwig, published by Appleton & Co., furnish reading as intensely interesting as a novel, and at the same time elevating and instructive. The Publishers have spared no pains in making the book attractive to the eye.

## INDEX TO VOL. IV. NEW SERIES, 1866.

- Adams, Wm., The war for Independence, and the war for Secession, 78-93.
- Adams, Samuel, life of, noticed, 341.
- Agassiz, Structure of Animal Life, noticed, 340.
- Alexander, J. A., Isaiah, noticed, 176.
- Alford, Henry, on Study of New Test. 506.
- American Tract Society, works of, noticed, 186, 337.
- Annales de Philos. Chr., noticed, 189.
- Annuaire Philosophique, noticed, 339.
- Astie, J. F., Explication of Gospel of John, noticed, 175: Hist. United States, 182.
- Athanasian Creed, 584-625.
- Atonement, Bushnell on, reviewed, 162-172.
- Baird's Life, noticed, 343.
- Ballantine, Prof. E., Jesus Christ and Criminal Law, 537-550.
- Bowen's Daily Meditations, noticed, 337.
- Brit. and Foreign Evang. Rev. 195.
- Brockhaus's Bibliotheca Historica, 663.
- Buck's Mass. Eccles. Law, noticed, 336.
- Bulletin Theologique, 665.
- Bunsen's Bibel-werk, 335.
- Bushnell on the Atonement 162-172.
- Carlyle's Friedrich the Second, noticed, 184; 343.
- Caro, Idea of God, noticed, 339.
- Cobden's Life, noticed, 184.
- Conyngnam's Sherman's March, noticed, 183.
- Critical Notes on Books, 172-188, 335-348, 503-514, 671-2.
- Dante, translated by Philalethes, 661.
- Davenport, J. S. on Christian Unity, 304.
- Day, H. N., The Nature and Validity of Induction, 50-78.
- Deschamps' True System, noticed, 189.
- Divine Revelation, 646-660.
- Doolittle, Life of Chinese, noticed, 513.
- Draper's Text Books, etc. noticed, 339 340.
- Duyckink's Cyclopedia of American Literature, noticed, 345.
- Ecclesiastical Register, 353-356.
- England, Intelligence, 195; 350; 669.
- Epictetus, Works of, noticed 346.
- Esperance, by Meta Lander, noticed, 513.
- Firkowitsch manuscripts, 662.
- Fisher, J. P., Essays on Supernatural Origin of Christianity, noticed, 174; Life of Silliman, noticed, 509.
- Foundations of our Faith, noticed, 336.
- France, Intelligence, 188; 349; 664.
- France, Reformed Church of, 424-465.
- Frank, Hist. of Prot. Theology, noticed, 173.
- Froude's Hist. England, noticed, 181.
- Fullness of the Time, 375-402.
- Gedanke, der, 179, 660.
- General Assembly, Presbyterian, at St. Louis, 474-503.
- Germany, Intelligence, 188; 348; 660.
- Gillett, E. H. The Westminster Confession in England and Ireland, 100-126.
- God, the Being of, 357-374.
- Goulburn, E. M., works of noticed, 338, 511.
- Harbaugh, H., Relation of the Old Testament to the New, 33.
- Hatfield, E. F., Ecclesiastical Register, 353-356.
- Heidenheim's German Quarterly, 661.
- Hengstenberg on John, noticed, 177.
- Henne von Sargans, Manethos, noticed, 180.



- Holland and Belgium, *Intelligence*, 193; 666
- Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, noticed, 172.
- Hyacinthe's *Discourses*, 359
- Hymnal of Presb. Church, noticed, 336
- Induction, *The Nature and Validity of*, 50-78
- Ingham on Baptism, 504
- Italy, *Intelligence*, 194; 666
- Jahrbucher f. deutsche Theologie, 348; 663
- James iv. 5, in connection with Genesis iv, 7, 292
- Jesus Christ and Criminal law, 537-550
- Johnson. Rev. J. M., *The Name of the Lord*, 465-474
- Journal of Sacred Lit. 195; 351
- Julius Caesar, *History of*, noticed, 672.
- Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary*, noticed, 177.
- Kellogg on Shakspeare, noticed, 513.
- Kollner, *Summary of Church History*, noticed, 343
- Laboulaye's *Hist. of United States*, 664
- Lange's *Commentary*, noticed, 504.
- Lewis, Tayler, *The Bible Idea of Truth as Inseparable from the Divine Personality*, 199-214
- Liefde, *Charities of Europe*, noticed, 512
- Liturgies, *The Ancient Catholic*, 230-247.
- Liturgische Gewander, 669.
- Luttheroth, on *Taxing of Cyrenius*, 665.
- Manning, Archbishop, *Temporal Mission*, etc. noticed, 504.
- Marsh's *Temperance Recollections*, 511.
- Masson, Gustave, *Quatremere, the French Orientalist*, 247-72.
- Masson's *British Philosophy*, noticed, 179.
- Maxims for Sermonizing, 9-32.
- McCosh, James, on *Mill*, noticed, 506.
- Mill's *Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy* 126-162; on *Comte*, noticed, 178.
- Missionary Jubilee, Baptist, noticed, 510.
- Morgan on 1st. Ep. John, noticed, 177.
- Name of the Lord, 465-474.
- Nevin, J. W. *Translation of Rothe on Divine Revelation* 646-660.
- Niedner, 192.
- Nitzsch on Augustine on Miracles, noticed, 335.
- Oosterzee, J. J. van, *The Fullness of the Time*, 375-402.
- Owen, Robert, *Life of*, noticed 344.
- Palfrey's *History of New England* 508.
- Palm, Van der, *Life*, noticed, 183.
- Perry, *Political Economy*, noticed, 178
- Petigru's *Biography*, noticed, 343.
- Petofi's *Poems*, 667.
- Political Crisis, *The*, 62b-646.
- Political Situation, *The*, 298-344.
- Prentiss, G. L., *The Political Situation*, 298-334; *The Political Crisis*, 625-646
- Presbyterian Publication Committee, works of, noticed, 337, 512
- Pusey's *Letter*, 351; his *Erenicon*, 503.
- Quatremere, the French Orientalist, 247.
- Raphael Sanzio, 402-424.
- Reformed Church of France, 424-465.
- Reid, John, *Voices of the Soul*, noticed, 174.
- Relations of the Old Testament to the New, 33-50.
- Revue Chretienne, noticed, 188.
- Richardson, Charles, 352.
- Rivas, Duke de, 195.
- Robertson, F. W., *Life and Letters*, noticed, 507.
- Robertson, John, *Sermons*, noticed, 505.
- Robinson, Stuart, *Discourses*, noticed, 671.
- Rothe, R., on *Divine Revelation*, translated, 646-660.
- Ruskin's *Precious Thoughts*, noticed, 185.
- Russia, *Intelligence*, 193.
- Ryle, J. C., on John, noticed, 177.
- Sacraments, *The Patristic Doctrine of the*, 93-100.
- Sandwich Islands Mission and Calumniators, 550-584.
- Scandinavia, *Intelligence*, 667.
- Schaff, Philip., *Patristic Doctrine of the Sacraments*, 93-100; *The An-*



# INDEX.

v

- cient Catholic Liturgies, 220-47; The Athanasian Creed, 584-625: his Person of Christ, noticed, 173; his edition of Lange, noticed, 506.
- Scripture, The Double Sense of, 214-230.
- Sermons, Different Species of 515-536.
- Shedd, G. T. W., Maxims for Sermonizing 9-33; Bushnell on the Atonement, 162-72: his revision of Lange on Mark, noticed, 506.
- Silliman, Life of, noticed, 509.
- Simancas Archives, 350.
- Smith, H. B., Mills's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy, 126-162; The General Assembly at St. Louis, 474-503.
- Smith, Rev. Robert Payne, 196.
- Smith, William, Dict. of Bible, noticed, 176.
- Spain, Intelligence, 195; 350.
- Spaventa's Philosophy, 194.
- Spring, Gardiner, Reminiscences, 183.
- Squier, Miles P., The Being of God, 357-374.
- Stanley's Jewish Church, noticed, 509.
- Stevens, Abel, Centenary of Methodism, noticed, 348; Women of Methodism, noticed, 510.
- Stone, John S., Living Temple, noticed, 504.
- Studien und Kritiken, 191, 349, 663.
- Swedish Versions of New Test., 667.
- Switzerland, Intelligence, 668.
- Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift, 190, 348.
- Theological and Literary Intelligence, 88-198; 348-353; 660-671.
- Theologische Quartalschrift, 348, 349.
- Tischendorf's Nov. Test. Sinait. 192.
- Tracy, Rev. Joseph, The Sandwich Islands Mission, 550-584.
- Truth, The Bible Idea of, as Inseparable from the Divine Personality 199-214.
- Tyler, W. S., The Double Sense of Scripture, 214-30.
- United States of America, Intelligence, 197, 353, 670.
- Vaughan, Christ the Light of the World, notice, 338.
- Vera, Hegelian Essays, noticed, 340.
- War for Independence and the War for Secession, The, 78-92.
- Wayland, Rev. Francis, 198.
- Westervelt, Rev. J. P., Translation of Van Oosterzee, 375-402: translation of Van der Palm's Life, noticed, 183.
- Westminster Confession, The, in England and Ireland, 100-126.
- Wood, Homes without Hands, noticed 672.
- Worcester, Jos. Emerson, 197.
- Zeitschrift f. exacte Phil. 179.
- Zeitschrift f. hist. Theol. 190, 348, 662
- Zeitschrift f. lutherische Theologie, 348
- Zeitschrift f. Philosophie, 179.
- Zeitschrift f. Wiss. Theol. 191, 663.
- Zeller's Treatises, noticed, 342.

ar

It c  
with  
affair  
the al  
and a

It  
make  
week  
Agen  
offere

Woe

AM

This  
Am  
"Isom  
and P  
Hudso  
"Perv  
and D  
Intell  
Greece  
intersa

It co  
list of  
positio  
Tern

“

(1.)  
should  
(2.)  
is good  
superior  
Form.

(3.)  
and are  
The  
and bu

Brann

## AGENTS WANTED IN EVERY TOWN OF THE UNION FOR Wedgwood's Government and Laws of the U. S.

A COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF THE RISE, PROGRESS, AND PRESENT ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS.

It contains the *minimum* of law which every citizen should possess to enable him to discharge with intelligence and fidelity, his duties to the State and to the Nation, and to conduct his private affairs with perfect safety to himself and justice to others. It has been submitted to the criticism of the ablest jurists, who commend it and its objects most heartily. A perusal of the table of contents and a single chapter will convince any intelligent voter of the need of the knowledge presented.

IT IS STRICTLY A SUBSCRIPTION BOOK. Reliable, active men and women, who wish to do good and make money, can do both by canvassing for this book. Some of our Agents are making over \$100 a week. A circular, giving Title-page, Table of Contents, Testimonials, and Specimen pages, with Agency documents, will be sent on application. Territory carefully assigned, and liberal inducements offered to Agents.

J. W. SCHERMERHORN & CO., Publishers, 430 Broome St., N. Y.

Western Publishers, Speakman & Proctor, 6 Custom House Place, Chicago.

## AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY, DEVOTED TO POPULAR INSTRUCTION AND LITERATURE.

This is a first-class Journal, useful to all who are directly or remotely interested in Education.

Among the original papers in the September number, are, "Liberal Education," by Mr. Spalding. "Isometric Drawing," by Prof. Plympton; "Professor Alphonzo Wood in California;" "Chemical and Physical Manipulation," by Mr. Phil; "The Fugitive," a Dialogue, by Miss Barbour; "Henry Hudson," by J. J. Stevenson. Editorials on "Keys to Success in Modern Scholastic Enterprises;" "Perverted Education;" "Journalistic Honesty." Letters from William L. Gage, now in Germany, and Dr. Hooker, of Yale College. Items of what is new in "Science and the Arts." "Educational Intelligence" from all quarters of the United States, as well as from England, Ireland, France, Russia, Greece, India, Sandwich Islands, and Hayti. Several candid reviews of Books. Choice selections are interspersed throughout the Magazine.

It contains elaborate accounts of new School-Books, Maps, Charts, &c., &c., with a complete price list of all the articles usually required for school use. Also a classified list of Teachers who are seeking positions. "No Educator can afford to be without it," and "all will be pleased with it."

Terms, per annum, \$1 50. \$3 Specimens mailed prepaid for TWELVE CENTS (four red stamps).

J. W. SCHERMERHORN & CO., Publishers, 430 Broome St., N. Y.

## "American School Institute," Founded 1855,

IS A RELIABLE EDUCATIONAL BUREAU:

(1.) To aid all who seek well-qualified Teachers. Principals, School Officers and Heads of Families should send full particulars of what Teachers they want, and ask for the "Teachers' Bulletin."

(2.) To represent Educated Teachers who desire positions. The demand for experienced Teachers is good, especially for those who teach Classics, Military Tactics, and Music. Professors of Music and superior Female Music Teachers are always in demand. All Teachers should have the "Application Form."

(3.) To give parents information of good Schools. Facts concerning Schools are properly classified and are promptly submitted to those who seek Schools for their children and wards.

The *reliability* of the "American School Institute" is amply vouched for by well-known Educators and business men in all sections of the country. This testimony will be sent when desired.

J. W. SCHERMERHORN, A. M., Actuary, 430 Broome St., N. Y.

Branch Offices in Philadelphia, Chicago and Savannah.